



Security Council

Sixty-third year

Provisional

5886th meeting

 Tuesday, 6 May 2008, 10 a.m.
 New York

President:	Sir John Sawers/Ms. Pierce	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
Members:	Belgium	Mr. Verbeke
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Jurica
	France	Mr. Lacroix
	Indonesia	Mr. Natalegawa
	Italy	Mr. Mantovani
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Ettalhi
	Panama	Mr. Suescum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	South Africa	Ms. Qwabe
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

Briefings by Chairmen of subsidiary bodies of the Security Council

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.



The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Briefings by Chairmen of subsidiary bodies of the Security Council

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Australia, Cuba, India, Israel, Japan, Qatar, Slovenia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

At this meeting, we will hear briefings by His Excellency Mr. Neven Jurica, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism; His Excellency Mr. Johan Verbeke, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities; and His Excellency Mr. Jorge Urbina, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004).

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Neven Jurica.

Mr. Jurica (Croatia): I shall first make a joint statement on behalf of the Chairmen of the 1267, 1373 and 1540 Committees, followed by my own statement

in my capacity as the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC).

On behalf of the Chairmen of the three subsidiary bodies of the Security Council established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004), I would like to make some introductory remarks on the cooperation between those Committees.

As requested by the Security Council in all its recent resolutions pertaining to the Al-Qaida and Taliban Sanctions Committee, the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the 1540 Committee — and more specifically in resolutions 1735 (2006), 1805 (2008) and 1810 (2008) — we have worked on enhancing the ongoing cooperation between our three Committees, mostly through our expert groups.

Over the past few months, the three expert groups have continued to jointly implement their common strategy approved by the three Committees in 2007 to assist non- and late-reporting States. After the first regional workshop — which was held in Dakar at the end of September 2007 for West and Central African States — a second one, still in cooperation with the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, was organized on 29 and 30 November 2007 in Gaborone for Southern African States. As was done after the Dakar workshop, a post-workshop briefing for all African Union missions in New York was held on 18 December 2007. The third subregional workshop, for Northern and Eastern African States, is envisaged to take place in November 2008.

Those workshops provided an opportunity for the experts of the three Committees to jointly interact with the officials in charge of the implementation of the measures decided by the Council, and therefore to update them on the work of the Committees. They also enhanced the understanding of Member States of the different mandates and roles of the three Committees. Progress has already been achieved as new reports and additional information on States' implementation have been submitted to the three Committees.

Another concrete example of such cooperation is the visits to Member States carried out jointly by the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) and the experts of the 1267 Committee's Monitoring Team. So far, nine such visits have taken place, the most recent one to Saudi Arabia from 22 to 29 March 2008. In order to derive common benefit

from the CTC's visit to Niger last February and from the mission led by the Chairman of the 1267 Committee to Mauritania, Senegal and Mali, each provided input and questions to the other prior to the trips and information was subsequently exchanged between the Committees and expert groups.

We continue to encourage our three expert groups to share, as appropriate, information and their analyses of the efforts by Member States to implement their obligations under the relevant Security Council resolutions. That exchange of information also includes requests for technical assistance and other requests made by States. Since the last briefing to the Security Council, the Monitoring Team, CTED and the 1540 expert group have continued their regular contacts in order to maximize the exchange of information and the sharing of resources, as well as to avoid duplication. We also encourage our experts to work closely together as they develop their relationships with other relevant international, regional and subregional organizations, which could possibly be an avenue for even closer cooperation.

The three expert groups are also cooperating within the framework of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, which was established to ensure overall coordination and coherence in the counter-terrorism efforts of the United Nations system in the context of the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

That cooperation is not only crucial for the effectiveness of the work of our respective Committees; it is also essential for the coherence of the important contribution of the Council in countering these threats. Avoiding duplication of efforts is of paramount importance. To that end, together with our expert groups, a comparative table has been developed to highlight the main aspects of the respective mandates and areas of competence of the three Committees and of their expert groups. We are of the view that that will be a useful tool for Member States to better understand the specificities and complementarities of our work. The table will be issued today in a press release and will be posted on our respective websites. It will also be used in our various outreach activities and interactions with Member States, with which rests the primary responsibility to implement the obligations under the relevant Security Council resolutions.

Terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction pose a threat to international peace and security, and cooperation by all remains crucial. The Al-Qaida and Taliban Sanctions Committee, the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004), as well as their respective expert groups, remain committed, within their respective mandates, to their work to contribute to the overall United Nations and international efforts to assist States to fully implement the respective resolutions. In that context, the three Committees look forward to further guidance from the Council on areas of common interest in order better to coordinate their efforts, as indicated in resolutions 1805 (2008) and 1810 (2008).

In my capacity as the Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001), known as the Counter-Terrorism Committee, it is my honour to brief the Security Council and the wider membership on the work of the Committee in the past six months.

As terrorism remains one of the major threats to international peace and security, the Committee is a crucial instrument of the international community to address that global scourge. As the Chairman of the Committee, I intend to abide by its guiding principles and focus on concrete results and achieving realistic objectives. I believe that the Committee should adopt a pragmatic approach in order to fulfil obligations entrusted to it by resolution 1373 (2001).

Before entering into the core of this presentation, I would like to extend the Committee's gratitude to Mr. Mike Smith, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED), and his team for their valuable assistance. I also appreciate the constructive atmosphere in the Committee, which greatly contributes to fulfilling its mandate.

Transparency is one of the basic principles in our work and therefore, together with the Executive Director, I briefed the States Member of the United Nations on the work of the Committee and CTED on 29 April, and we intend to continue with that practice in the future.

At the outset, I am pleased to report that, since the last briefing in November 2007, the Committee has initiated or accomplished several key initiatives that have established a sound basis for our future work.

The first accomplishment is the adoption of the new organizational plan of CTED. The Security Council heard a detailed presentation of the plan by the Executive Director at its meeting on 19 March. Without unnecessary repetition, for the purposes of this briefing I would like to reiterate its main elements.

The adjustments to CTED's organization and methods of work will have the effect of improving the quality and consistency of its technical judgments and will enhance the ongoing dialogue between CTED and the Member States. It will also strengthen CTED's cooperation with relevant international, regional and subregional organizations.

The plan further envisages an addition to the existing practice of conducting full-scale assessment missions by organizing more flexible visits tailored to the specific circumstances and the nature of the terrorist threat in countries belonging to all regions. The increased flexibility should make the work of CTED more efficient and allow it to focus on issues of the highest priority to the Committee and to the visited country. The organizational plan also gives greater priority to engaging donors and matching their capacities with the needs of recipient countries, as well as to implementing a more proactive communications strategy and strengthening collaboration among Security Council expert bodies active in the counter-terrorism field.

The plan charted the way forward for CTED, and was affirmed in Security Council resolution 1805 (2008), adopted on 20 March. The resolution extended the mandate of CTED until the end of 2010, but also set the direction for the Committee in the next few years. The resolution contains a provision for an interim review by 30 June 2009 and a comprehensive consideration of CTED's work prior to the expiration of its mandate.

The second major initiative is the adoption of Preliminary Implementation Assessments (PIAs), which are basically tools geared towards intensifying dialogue with Member States on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). By the end of last year, 158 PIAs had been adopted, and since then the Committee has continued to analyse, through its subcommittees chaired by France, the Russian Federation and Viet Nam, and adopt the remaining documents. Thus far, the Committee has adopted some 167 PIAs, and the rest should be formally approved by the Committee in the

coming months. One of the goals of the current chairmanship is to make sure that every Member State receives a copy of its preliminary assessment.

The Committee adopted its work programme for the period 1 January to 30 June, and divided its activities into several main categories. Within the first category, monitoring and promoting the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001), besides adopting the PIAs, the Committee has commenced its consideration of a revised version of a document entitled "Survey of the implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) by Member States". That document was first discussed in the Committee in May 2007 and was subsequently revised on the basis of the views of Committee members and the updated evaluations of implementation contained in the PIAs. The survey examines the implementation of counter-terrorism efforts in all regions and subregions, pinpoints areas for further improvements and identifies shortfalls and vulnerabilities that need to be addressed either in particular regions or at the global level.

In that context, let me remind the Council that resolution 1805 (2008) directs the Committee to submit an annual report on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). While the decision on the status of the survey is still being discussed, many delegations have stated that the document could serve as a useful tool for the Committee to define its priorities in its future programmes of work.

Another important activity of the Committee is organizing visits to Member States. Throughout this year, the Committee is performing visits that were approved at the end of 2006. Those visits, which are carried out with the consent of the countries involved, constitute a fundamental component in effectively monitoring and promoting the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and allow CTED to gain first-hand experience on the ground. Since our last briefing, the Committee has concluded successful full-fledged on-site visits to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Niger and Saudi Arabia; as we speak the Committee is in Cambodia, and will later visit the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

The visits typically include experts from CTED and other international and regional organizations, and result in a comprehensive assessment of all counter-terrorism measures. That not only enhances the Committee's understanding of the counter-terrorism

measures in place, including challenges, best practices and technical assistance needs or programmes, but also strengthens its cooperation with the other international organizations involved. Furthermore, following the proposal in the organizational plan to conduct flexible visits, the Committee conducted a fact-finding mission to Jamaica.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Governments of those Member States for their valuable cooperation in the preparations for the Committee's visits. In addition, the Committee will continue encouraging Member States to become party to and implement the 16 international counter-terrorism instruments.

Regarding the second category, facilitation of technical assistance, the Committee and CTED in particular are engaged in continuous dialogue with Member States, and their role in facilitating technical assistance is growing in importance. With that in mind, as part of its reorganization, CTED is reviewing the existing strategies and mechanisms for facilitating technical assistance and for refining them with a view to strengthening the Committee's contribution and recording its impact in the technical assistance field. The challenge in the forthcoming period will be to devise more creative approaches so that the Committee, through CTED, can exercise its brokering role as effectively as possible.

In its dialogue with Member States, the Committee continued reminding them that they must ensure that any measures taken to combat terrorism comply with all their obligations under international law, in particular international human rights, refugee and humanitarian law.

The Committee also posted on its website two helpful tools: the technical assistance matrix, which is targeted at donors to help them guide their assistance programmes and decision-making, and a directory of assistance, enabling recipients to view and identify the programmes that best suit their needs.

With respect to the implementation of resolution 1624 (2005), the Committee submitted to the Council its second report regarding progress made by Member States in its implementation. Likewise, in its work programme, the Committee has agreed to initiate discussions to explore the technical assistance needs of States to implement the resolution, as well as to facilitate the provision of such assistance, while

encouraging those States that have not yet reported to do so.

The Committee continues to play its part in the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, and CTED is participating actively in the work of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. The Committee is also assisting Member States in implementing those provisions of the Strategy that fall within its mandate. The Committee has included in its work programme a discussion of its contribution to the implementation of the Strategy.

The Committee continued to cooperate with other relevant parts of the United Nations system and specialized bodies, and in particular with the two other Security Council committees that deal with counter-terrorism, as requested by the Council in its resolution 1805 (2008). Furthermore, as the Council has just heard in the joint message, the second workshop in the framework of the common strategy by the three Security Council Committees for non-reporting and late-reporting States was organized for States of the Southern African Development Community on 29 and 30 November 2007 in Gaborone.

Finally, as part of its cooperation and exchange of information with counter-terrorism partners during its meetings in New York, the Committee heard several briefings by representatives of relevant organizations and United Nations bodies.

The President: I thank Ambassador Jurica for his briefing. I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Johan Verbeke.

Mr. Verbeke (Belgium): Allow me to simply highlight the main elements contained in my more comprehensive report prepared for the Council. That comprehensive version has been distributed and will be posted on the Committee's website.

At the outset, I would like to underline that the sanctions regime established under resolution 1267 (1999) is a powerful tool in the fight against Al-Qaida and Taliban-related terrorism. The measures taken against individuals and entities on the consolidated list are universal in nature and hence can complement measures taken at the national, regional and subregional levels.

Improving the quality of the consolidated list continues to be at the core of the Committee's work. In that regard, I would like to stress that the Committee

relies on the information provided by Member States. Let me take this opportunity to emphasize that it is the prerogative, but also the collective responsibility, of all of us to bring to the Committee's attention any information that one believes should be included in or deleted from the list. Our common objective should be to have a dynamic list reflecting the evolution of the threat posed by Al-Qaida and the Taliban. In this respect, and given the increasingly strong links between terrorism activities and illicit drugs, I would like to underline once again the possibility to submit for listing the names of drug traffickers involved in the financing of Al-Qaida and the Taliban, as provided for in paragraph 12 of resolution 1735 (2006).

During the last six months, most of the Committee's activities have been derived from its consideration of the seventh report of the Monitoring Team and the follow-up thereto. Different discussions were held on the issues related to the three sanctions measures: assets freeze, travel ban and arms embargo. The Committee has also been exploring ways to further improve its procedures. As a result, a standard form for de-listing has been developed and is now available in the de-listing section of the Committee's website. The Committee is also examining the procedures for removing the names of deceased individuals and considering the further revision of its guidelines with regard to exemptions to the assets freeze and to the travel ban, with a view to providing further guidance to Member States.

Pursuant to paragraph 21 of resolution 1735 (2006), the Committee continued its discussion on the identification of possible cases of non-compliance with the sanctions measures. With the objective of improving the effectiveness and implementation of the sanctions regime, the Committee first discussed each possible case of non-compliance mentioned by the Monitoring Team and, secondly, derived horizontal recommendations from this empirical analysis, aimed at preventing the occurrence of such cases. I reported to the Council on the Committee's consideration of this matter in a briefing held on 24 April 2008. Identifying possible cases of non-compliance constitutes an ongoing exercise, and the Committee will continuously follow up on that.

The Committee further considered the issue of the criminal misuse of the Internet for terrorist purposes. The Committee shares the concerns expressed over the fact that the Internet constitutes a

powerful medium and instrument for Al-Qaida, the Taliban and their associates. Although this is a complex issue, of which certain aspects clearly go beyond the Committee's mandate, it was agreed to continue the discussion in the future.

This week, the Committee is starting its consideration of the eighth report of the Monitoring Team, submitted to the Committee in accordance with resolution 1735 (2006). The report will shortly be transmitted to the Council, and the Committee intends to prepare a report reflecting its position on the recommendations contained therein.

Further enhancing the dialogue with Member States and increasing the transparency of its work remain one of the primary concerns of the Committee. To that end, I gave an open briefing to all interested Member States on 18 December 2007.

Country visits are another way to interact with Member States. As Chairman, I recently visited Mauritania, Senegal and Mali. Several incidents that occurred in their region during the months prior to the trip had underlined once more that the terrorist threat in the Sahel region is real. Whereas all three countries had a good understanding of the sanctions regime and demonstrated their strong commitment in the common efforts to counter terrorism, authorities also clearly expressed their need for assistance to further strengthen their capacities.

Pursuant to paragraph 29 of resolution 1735 (2006), the Committee met yesterday with representatives of Denmark, Liechtenstein, Sweden and Switzerland for an in-depth discussion on relevant issues. This exchange of views has been, I think, of mutual benefit. I would like to take advantage of today's briefing to encourage all other interested Member States to meet with the Committee.

I would also use this opportunity to sincerely thank the experts of the Monitoring Team for their invaluable support and contribution to the work of the Committee. In addition to their visits and various outreach activities, their input and proposals for all issues on the Committee's agenda have been highly appreciated and have undoubtedly contributed to the progress made so far.

It is clear from events in past months that the threat from Al-Qaida and the Taliban has not diminished. Within the United Nations efforts, the

Committee is committed to continuing, in cooperation with Member States, to assume its share of responsibility in this global endeavour. To this end, the Committee looks forward to further guidance from the Security Council, inter alia, through the resolution to be adopted in June.

The President: I thank Ambassador Verbeke for his briefing and, in particular, for taking the trouble to prepare a summary of the full report for the Council's deliberations. I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Jorge Urbina.

Mr. Urbina (Costa Rica) (spoke in Spanish): As Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to Security Council resolution 1540 (2004), I am presenting to the Security Council and the membership of the Organization the report covering the six months since the presentation of the most recent joint report to the Security Council, which took place on 14 November 2007. The report summarizes the activities that culminated in the approval of resolution 1810 (2008), relative to the continued implementation of provisions in resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006).

(spoke in English)

Resolution 1673 (2006) called upon States not yet reporting on progress made to implement resolution 1540 (2004) to do so without delay, and also encouraged all previously reporting States to submit additional information on progress made as well.

Six months before the deadline for submission of its biennial report to the Security Council, the Committee decided to make a special effort to encourage States to meet the reporting requirements. By mid-November 2007, the matrices of all Member States-based on previously submitted information or, in the case of non-reporting States, compiled from official websites of Governments and international organizations — were sent to all Member States to be checked for accuracy and to provide a first report or additional information on relevant measures taken or planned to be taken.

As of 27 April 2008, more than half the Member States have responded to the Committee's request for more information, bringing the number of States that have submitted at least one report since 2004 to over 150. Within this group, the number of States submitting additional information at least once has now reached

100. The Committee takes this opportunity to thank all the States that have responded promptly and to encourage the remaining States that have not yet reported to do so as soon as possible.

The Committee has continued to rely on outreach activities to promote full implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). Since mid-November 2007, the Chairman or some members of the Committee, officially representing the Committee, and its experts participated in 11 outreach conferences, seminars and workshops. The purposes of that participation ranged from raising awareness about the requirements to achieve full implementation of the resolution and encouraging States to submit reports on the status of their implementation efforts to sharing experiences and lessons learned and engaging in dialogue with participating officials from Governments and organizations particularly interested in the work of the Committee.

The Committee has been engaged in three types of outreach activities.

First, the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs has organized workshops on the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). A workshop on the reporting requirements and assistance needs was organized in Botswana on 27 and 28 November 2007 for participants from 22 African countries.

Secondly, we have held common-strategy workshops to encourage non-responding States to submit reports. With sponsorship by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), another workshop was held in Botswana on 29 and 30 November 2007, an event organized jointly with the 1540 Committee's experts, the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) and the Monitoring Team of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities. The Committee appreciates the cooperation extended by the UNODC in this regard.

Thirdly, we have also organized other outreach events. Upon invitation by other bodies, the Committee's Chairman or some of its members, officially representing the Committee, and several of its experts participated in relevant meetings on subjects ranging from the implementation of the universal conventions against terrorism and of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy to the legal

aspects of international instruments countering terrorist acts in the nuclear, chemical or biological fields and other specific subjects such as proliferation, financing and illicit trafficking in nuclear materials.

The Committee expresses its appreciation to the Governments of Andorra, Belarus, Botswana, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Norway, Slovakia and the United States of America, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and UNODA for their sponsorship and organization of the different activities, and the European Union for its ongoing support of the Committee's outreach activities.

(spoke in French)

The Committee continued to operate as an information exchange centre on issues relating to assistance through formal and informal contacts and dialogue with States that might be interested in requesting assistance and those that might be in a position to offer it. To this end, it organized a dialogue with participants in the outreach activities. In December 2007, it put the final touches on a model request for assistance adapted to each case and, taking into account its centralizing role, sent it to all Member States in order to better understand their needs in specific areas and to match their requests with offers of assistance from other States.

Since the jointly drafted common strategy paper was presented to the Security Council in November 2007, the 1540 Committee has continued to work closely with the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the 1267 Committee. Moreover, the groups of experts that assist the three Committees have increased their collaboration, as was seen in the subregional African workshop mentioned previously. One important aspect of those joint activities is the Committee's interaction with delegations of national officials from each of the concerned countries, representing two or three different competent ministries, with a view to promoting coordination and alleviating the task of responding to so many requests for information.

Efforts to further strengthen cooperation with the competent regional and international organizations and machinery continue. The exchange of information and the reciprocal participation in outreach activities have facilitated progress in this area. In December 2007, the Committee sent letters to the heads of more than 30 international, regional and subregional organizations and to authorities of the export control regimes and

other mechanisms, requesting them to draw to the attention of their member States to the important links between the implementation of the provisions of resolution 1540 (2004) and the objectives of their respective institutions. By April 2008, the Security Council had received 12 positive replies from these organizations.

Since January 2008, the subcommittees of the 1540 Committee have concentrated their work on examining the information that is in the matrices of Member States, as reviewed by experts, on the basis of new information coming from the States and other data from official sources. The information has provided the factual data used as a basis for preparing the report of the 1540 Committee that will be submitted to the Security Council, covering the period starting on 28 April 2006. The report will be presented to Council as soon as possible, or by 31 July 2008 at the latest.

On 25 April 2008, the Security Council adopted resolution 1810 (2008), by which it extended the mandate of the 1540 Committee for a three-year period and, among other provisions, decided that the Committee would continue to intensify its efforts to promote complete implementation by all States of resolution 1540 (2004).

The President: I thank Mr. Urbina for his briefing.

In accordance with the understanding reached among Council members, I wish to remind all speakers from now on to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate their texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) *(spoke in Russian)*: First of all, I would like to thank Ambassadors Jurica, Verbeke and Urbina for their substantive briefings as Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities, and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004), respectively.

In highlighting the struggle with the threat of international terrorism as one of the most important tasks confronting the United Nations and its Security Council, Russia is giving a positive assessment of the results of the activity of those Committees during the six-month period just passed and is taking note of the substantive contribution that each of them, in accordance with its mandate, is making to the efforts of the Council to enhance the effectiveness of international counter-terrorism cooperation.

We welcome the joint steps in favour of interaction and coordination among the three Committees and, above all, their expert groups, within the framework of the ongoing dialogue with Member States.

The Russian Federation has taken an active part in drawing up and reaching agreement on resolution 1805 (2008), which not only extended the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) to the end of 2010, but also made specific adjustments to the organizational structure and methods of work of that body.

We have already expressed our assessments regarding the reform of the work of the CTED within the framework of the broad discussion of this issue that took place in March of this year. Without repeating these issues, I should like to note the most important thing: the CTC now has received additional significant possibilities not only to monitor the implementation by States of the fundamental anti-terrorist resolution 1373 (2001) but also to play a more active role in the support required for their multifaceted efforts in coping with the threat of terrorism.

We welcome the readiness of the CTC, acting through the CTED, to devote priority attention to the coordination of technical assistance and to expand direct contact with potential donors and interested States. We view that as an important factor in strengthening the entire system of international anti-terrorist cooperation and reaffirming the central coordinating role of the United Nations in this sphere.

Under the leadership of the CTC, work has been concluded for the preparation and adoption of a preliminary assessment of the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) with regard to all Member States. Russia fully shares the resounding positive assessments of the achievements of the CTC and, as Chairman of one of the subcommittees of the CTC, is

ready to continue to make its contribution to the dynamic process of producing those assessments. What lies ahead is a complex period of renewal and clarification of those documents in the light of the reactions of States, and the political guidance role of the CTC at this stage will only grow stronger. In this context we attach great importance to the organization by the CTED of trips of various types and with various objectives to States and monitoring the results of their work.

We also believe that, together with an assessment of national potentials, the CTC very soon can also adopt the global survey of the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). The need for such a document is obvious to us. It could serve as a basis for a continually updated general overview of the achievements and shortcomings in the anti-terrorist sphere. It would also enable the Security Council to organize its work in this field in a more systematic way, including within the framework of implementation of the objective of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

I should like to confirm that the Russian Federation considers that one of the most important elements of the CTC mandate is to consider the work with States on the implementation of resolution 1624 (2005). In this connection we welcome the decision of the CTC to hold a discussion on the question of possible measures to render technical assistance to States on the implementation of the provisions of the resolution.

We continue to consider the 1267 Committee and the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team as one of the effective and viable mechanisms of the Security Council in the counter-terrorist field.

Unfortunately, we are obliged to note with regret the continuing spread of extremist ideas and of the influence of the Taliban both in the territory of Afghanistan and beyond its borders. Terrorists do not sit on their hands. This has been clearly demonstrated in their recent brazen terrorist act during the military parade in Kabul.

We welcome the efforts of the 1267 Committee and the Monitoring Team to support the sanctions list in its updated form, reflecting the real nature of today's terrorist threat. We call upon States to submit to the Committee requests for the inclusion on the list of individuals and organizations linked to the Taliban and

Al-Qaida and also to provide any additional information regarding such individuals previously included on the list.

We consider the strengthening of cooperation of the Committee and the Monitoring Team with INTERPOL and other professional regional and international organizations to be of considerable importance. We consider it necessary to continue the practice of country visits by the Chairman of the Committee and members of the Monitoring Team and other forms of direct dialogue by the Committee with Member States. That makes it possible to certify the commitment of States to the cause of the struggle against terrorism and to see at first hand the best practices and methods in such a struggle.

It is precisely full and conscientious implementation by all States of their obligations in this field that will determine the success of our common efforts to counteract the real and changing threat to international peace and security coming from the Taliban and Al-Qaida. We favour closer coordination in this area, above all with the Counter-Terrorism Committee and its Executive Directorate.

Regarding the activity of the 1540 Committee, we first would like to welcome the unanimous adoption on 25 April of resolution 1810 (2008), which extended the Committee's mandate for three years. As initiator and a sponsor of resolution 1540 (2004) and also of subsequent resolutions 1673 (2006) and 1810 (2008), the Russian Federation considers it one of the major international instruments for preventing weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery and related materials, including dual-use goods and technologies, from falling into the hands of non-State players, first and foremost terrorists.

We believe that despite the magnitude and complexity of these tasks, through joint multilateral efforts by the members of the international community, with the United Nations in the leading role, the Security Council will be able to close the remaining proliferation gaps in national legislation and to strengthen the basis for coordinated resistance to the black markets in weapons of mass destruction.

During the period that has elapsed since the previous briefing, which was marked by the adoption of resolution 1810 (2008), the 1540 Committee has with confidence entered a new stage of its activity, linked to stepped-up efforts to assist States in the

implementation of the provisions of resolution 1540 (2004) and to coordinate close international cooperation for those ends.

At this stage it will be important to focus efforts on the weak aspects of national monitoring systems, identified as a result of the study of information on measures undertaken by States, as submitted in the national reports to the 1540 Committee. In this context we believe it important not to forget about the need to implement another key objective of the first stage of the Committee's work, linked with the submission by States of their first national reports on measures they have undertaken in implementation of resolution 1540 (2004).

We note with satisfaction data to the effect that after last November the number of States that have submitted their first national reports has now increased to 150. Those States that have at least once sent the Committee additional information now exceeds 100. We believe this demonstrates that the Committee's active position is yielding tangible results. It is precisely for this reason that targeted work with States that have not yet submitted their first national reports must be continued.

It is important to continue work on reaching agreement on the report of the Security Council Committee on the results of the work for 2006 through 2008. We believe that the report must above all reflect the work of the Committee itself in implementing its objectives, whose priorities are clearly spelled out in resolution 1540 (2004). We are ready to participate constructively in further work on the draft, taking into account the remarks we have already made in this regard, in compliance with the clear time parameters laid down in resolution 1810 (2008).

Mr. Liu Zhenmin (China): The delegation of China thanks Ambassadors Jurica, Verbeke and Urbina for their respective briefings on the work of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism, and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004). China appreciates the effectiveness of the work of the three Ambassadors and their respective teams.

We appreciate the fact that the 1267 Committee has been making steady progress in all its work. The

Committee has made fresh progress in further improving the integrity and accuracy of its sanctions list, improving the transparency of its work, strengthening its website and increasing the exchanges and dialogue with the Member States and competent international organizations, fully acknowledging such progress.

China believes that maintaining the authority and understanding of the Committee requires the vigorous support of all Member States of the United Nations. China encourages all countries, in dealing with issues involved, to provide the Committee with detailed information to the greatest extent possible so as to improve the effectiveness and fairness of the sanctions mechanism. China supports the Committee in continuing to improve its working methods — including its listing and de-listing procedures — and in increasing its cooperation with mechanisms such as the CTC.

China congratulates Ambassador Jurica on his assumption of the chairmanship of the CTC. We believe that he will lead the Committee to further success in its work.

Since the previous briefing to the Council on the CTC, the Committee has adopted a revised organizational plan for the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED). The implementation of the plan has had a positive impact on the work of both the CTC and the CTED — a fact that China appreciates. We have also noted that the CTC has done a great deal of effective work in reviewing Preliminary Implementation Assessments, carrying out technical assistance visits to Member States and increasing the transparency of its work.

China believes that Security Council resolution 1805 (2008) has not only extended and clearly defined the mandate of the CTED, but has also pointed out the direction for the future work of the CTC. China hopes that the CTC and the CTED will follow the provisions set out in resolution 1805 (2008), will continue to follow the principles of cooperation, transparency and even-handedness and will advance their work in all areas, thereby making the Security Council's counter-terrorism mechanisms more comprehensive and effective.

China welcomes the fact that the mandate of the 1540 Committee has been renewed without difficulty. We hope that the Committee will, in accordance with

resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1810 (2008), formulate a comprehensive and balanced programme of work as soon as possible in order to effectively promote the comprehensive implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). China values the role played by the Committee, and we have been participating constructively and actively in the Committee's work in all areas. We are prepared to continue our active support for that work and to contribute to facilitating the comprehensive implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), to building consensus on non-proliferation and to promoting cooperation on non-proliferation throughout the world.

Over the past few months, despite the international community's tireless efforts to combat terrorism, terrorists and their violent acts have continued to be widespread worldwide. Terrorism continues to pose a serious threat to the peace and security of the international community. Therefore, the United Nations should continue to play a central role in the international fight and cooperation against terrorism.

China believes that the Security Council's adoption of resolutions 1805 (2008) and 1810 (2008) in swift succession demonstrated its members' common resolve to strengthen its counter-terrorism machinery and to strongly combat terrorism by sending a positive signal to the international community. China hopes that the three Committees will continue to pool their resources, improve their effectiveness and pay closer attention in their work to the views of developing countries and their counter-terrorism needs, so that the Council's counter-terrorism mechanisms can better meet the expectations of all Member States.

In September, the General Assembly will assess the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. That assessment will be of great importance for the counter-terrorism work of the United Nations. China supports the three Committees in actively implementing the Global Strategy within their respective mandates, so that the Security Council and the General Assembly can complement and coordinate with each other in their counter-terrorism efforts and can create favourable conditions for assessing the Strategy.

Mr. Suescum (Panama) (*spoke in Spanish*): Permit me, Sir, to congratulate you and your delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of May and on having organized

this debate. I also thank Ambassadors Jurica, Urbina and Verbeke for their briefings on the work of the Committees over which they preside. In particular, my delegation would like to recognize the work done and the dedication shown by Ambassador Verbeke as Chairman of the 1267 Committee, related to Al-Qaida, and to wish him every success in his new duties as Special Coordinator of the Secretary-General for Lebanon.

Effective compliance with the mandates of the Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004) requires constant review of their working methods. Panama welcomes the important work done by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities, because it has developed methodologies for deleting names of individuals, entities and deceased persons from the consolidated list. As Ambassador Verbeke indicated, that will produce a dynamic list that reflects the evolution of the threat to international peace and security represented by Al-Qaida and the Taliban. The views of interested Member States in that regard must be duly heard and heeded.

My delegation also highlights the significant progress made in recent months by the Counter-Terrorism Committee in assessing the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) in each of the countries Members of the Organization. The approval and referral of more than 167 Preliminary Implementation Assessments (PIAs) and the ongoing review of the study on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) are the Committee's main mechanisms for defining the current state of implementation.

It is worth pointing out that those documents are only practical tools for defining priorities and improving compliance with obligations under resolution 1373 (2001). The Committee should bear in mind that the PIAs and the study are living documents of a technical nature, adapted to the particular circumstances of a country, a region or a point in time. We must also strive for greater cooperation and coordination with the special Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, established by the General Assembly in 2005.

Panama attaches great importance to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. With the adoption of resolution 1810 (2008), the work of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) moves from merely monitoring the implementation of obligations to promoting best practices that facilitate the attainment of the objectives of its mandate and promoting dialogue among the Committee, States and other organizations or entities, in particular those having a broad and representative membership. We highlight, *inter alia*, the important work of the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force, established among States of the Caribbean basin, which supports countries in the region in implementing legislative and financial measures to prevent the financing of terrorism.

In order to more effectively accomplish the tasks entrusted to them, these subsidiary bodies must strengthen cooperation among themselves and with the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, always mindful that the diversity of approaches among the Committees represents a truly integrated response to the scourge of terrorism. All cooperation must focus on common areas under those bodies' respective mandates. Any proposal to merge the mandates and structures of these Committees must be examined very carefully, given the different objectives and nature of each mandate.

Finally, we should recall that we must always wage the fight against terrorism mindful of the importance of protecting and promoting human rights and respect for the rule of law.

Mr. Hoang Chi Trung (Viet Nam): First and foremost, I wish to congratulate you, Mr. President, and the United Kingdom for assuming the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I would also like to congratulate South Africa for having accomplished its presidency in an excellent manner.

My delegation welcomes this open debate of the Council, which provides an opportunity for the Chairs of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) to brief the Council and the larger United Nations membership on their work since their last joint briefing in November 2007. We take this opportunity to thank the three Committees, under the able leadership

of their Chairmen, and the expert bodies — the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED), the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team and the expert group of the 1540 Committee — for their great efforts in discharging their respective mandates.

Allow me to begin by reiterating my country's unwavering position that international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction constitute serious threats to international peace and security. Viet Nam has always been committed to the implementation of its obligations under the international treaties to which it is a party and Security Council resolutions in those areas. Since Viet Nam became a member of the Council, it has made constructive contributions to the work of those Committees, including through its assumption of the vice-chairmanship of the CTC.

My delegation shares the assessment of the three Committees Chairmen on the achievements made in the past six months. We would like to underline the activities of the 1267 Committee aimed at improving the effectiveness and the full and fair implementation of the sanctions regime under resolution 1267 (1999), in particular through improving the quality of the consolidated list, holding discussions to reach a consensus understanding among the members of the Committee on the three sanctions measures, and exploring ways to further improve the Committee's procedures.

For its part, the CTC has adjusted the organization and methods of work of CTED to improve the quality and consistency of its technical judgments and dialogue with Member States. We support the CTC efforts in considering the preliminary implementation assessments, which serve as a tool to intensify dialogue with every Member State on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). In that regard, my delegation wishes to express its special thanks to members of the Committee, especially those of sub-Committee C, CTED experts and the Committee's secretariat, for their cooperation. We will continue to participate in the discussion of the survey on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) by Member States, considering that document as providing a global picture of counter-terrorism efforts and identifying areas for further international cooperation to improve existing efforts.

My delegation appreciates the efforts made by the 1540 Committee during the past six months, including those to encourage States to meet the reporting requirements, its various outreach activities to promote full implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) and its work to coordinate the assistance to implement the resolution. We welcome the adoption of resolution 1810 (2008), which extended the mandate of the Committee until April 2011. In that regard, we wish to reiterate that the Committee's work should be in accordance with its mandate, international law and the Charter of the United Nations, thus actively contributing to the cooperation of the international community in counter-terrorism and non-proliferation.

With regard to the cooperation between the three Committees through their expert groups, my delegation takes note of the activities as presented in the joint statement. We look forward to seeing concrete cooperative actions undertaken by the three expert groups within the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, in the context of the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

My delegation wishes to promote the Committees' work in the coming months and takes this opportunity to highlight the following points.

First, the quality of the Committees' work depends very much on the cooperation of Member States in providing updated information on their implementation of the related obligations. The Council should continue to encourage the three Committees to work out further innovative ways to improve meaningful dialogues with Member States and enhance their support for the work of the Committees.

Secondly, the principal mandate of the Committees is to monitor the implementation of the relevant Council resolutions. The Committees should continue their efforts in trying to get as detailed and correct a picture as possible of the efforts made by Member States, understanding the difficulties and challenges they face and engaging them in finding appropriate measures to improve implementation.

Thirdly, while further efforts could be sought to define possible areas of common interest to improve coordination among the three Committees and their expert groups, that should be done with a very clear understanding of the different mandate of each body as laid out by the Council.

In conclusion, my delegation registers its continued commitment and cooperation for further success in the work of the three Committees.

Mr. Wolff (United States of America): I would like to thank the three Committee Chairmen for their briefings and for their joint statement on the cooperation among the three Security Council Committees that deal with the issues of terrorism and non-proliferation. The Chairmen's dedicated leadership is central to the effectiveness of those three subsidiary bodies, and we commend them for that leadership.

Since this is Ambassador Verbeke's last briefing on this matter, I would like to thank him for his service to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). He served with distinction, and we will miss his leadership in that Committee. I also would like to extend our appreciation to the experts groups of the three Committees for their invaluable support to the Committees.

Today's briefing is timely, given the recent renewal of the mandates of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) and the upcoming consideration of the mandate of the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). All three are now well established and ready to begin a new phase of their work.

I would like to focus on several ways in which the Committees can help counter the dual scourges of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which represent the pre-eminent threats to international peace and security today.

We believe a concentration on capacity-building is essential. Reports have been received and analysed. It is time to act on the findings of those evaluations. Resolution 1805 (2008) rightly stresses the important mandate of the CTC in that area. We welcome the new tools the CTC has developed, such as the technical assistance matrix and directory of assistance on the CTC website. We urge the CTC to continue its coordination with the G8 Counter-Terrorism Action Group and to organize regional meetings for States seeking and offering assistance. The 1267 Committee also has a key role in that area. To that end, it should

continue to share with the CTC information concerning States' technical assistance needs.

The 1540 Committee should work with States as an effective clearinghouse, using the information it has collected from States. It should then set about the work of building capacity. The Committee should proceed with its efforts to post its implementation matrices for resolution 1540 (2004) on its website, subject to States' consent. By doing so, the Committee can help States seeking to provide assistance to plan and execute assistance programmes. We also hope that States will use the new technical assistance template of the 1540 Committee to submit requests to the Committee. States should also submit action plans to the Committee, as my Government has done, so the Committee can use those plans to match requests with offers of assistance.

The United States is pleased to play its part in addressing States' technical assistance needs. Last year, for example, the United States Antiterrorism Assistance Program (ATA) trained over 4,500 participants from 64 countries. ATA's courses emphasize law enforcement under the rule of law and respect for human rights. In an effort to address the conditions that terrorists exploit for recruitment and ideological purposes, United States assistance programmes administered through the United States Agency for International Development and other agencies are increasing access to education, improving health care and focusing on democratic and economic reform. To support the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), the United States has provided over \$2 billion annually for assistance or other programmes.

We look forward to the completion of specific projects mentioned in the briefings. In particular, as Chairman Verbeke indicated, the 1267 Committee must continue to give priority to updating the consolidated list to ensure that it accurately reflects the current threat posed by Al-Qaida and the Taliban. We encourage other Member States to contribute to that effort by providing information for further listings and de-listings. The Committee should also continue its efforts to update the Taliban portion of the list by designating new Taliban who are responsible for the upsurge in violence in Afghanistan. Similarly, the Committee should de-list former Taliban who have severed their ties to the organization, and add new and updated biographical information to the list so that States can better enforce the sanctions.

The Committees have accomplished much. United Nations Member States have frozen \$150 million in terrorist assets by implementing the sanctions under resolution 1267 (1999). But we must not lose sight of the remaining challenges. Al-Qaida has expanded its operations and the Taliban are resurgent.

Finally, the prospect of terrorists gaining access to weapons of mass destruction remains the gravest threat imaginable. To counter terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the Committees must continue to focus on practical and concrete activities that can promote the capacity of States to implement the respective resolutions. We pledge our support in that essential fight.

Mr. Kafando (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): Allow me to thank and to congratulate Ambassadors Jurica, Urbina and Verbeke for their statements regarding the three Committees under their chairmanship, namely, the Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1373 (2001), 1540 (2004) and 1267 (1999), respectively. Members of the Council are unanimous in believing that theirs is effective and serious work that deserves our encouragement in moving ahead.

My delegation, which has always advocated strengthened cooperation among all United Nations bodies working to combat terrorism, very much appreciates this joint briefing, which clearly illustrates the joint, effective and complementary work being done by the three Committees. Moreover, the workshop held in Dakar, Senegal, in September 2007 for West African countries was a good example of the benefits of that cooperation. It is also gratifying to note that the three Committees have not lost sight of the need to provide appropriate technical assistance to States in accordance with their needs. That will enable States requesting such assistance to enhance their capacity to combat terrorist threats. As this is a collective and unified undertaking, it is important that, if possible, all States achieve the highest possible security standards in order to avert any potential breach that could be exploited by terrorist groups.

In their efforts to carry out joint visits to Member States, we must in particular encourage the 1267 and 1373 Committees to continue the process of improving their methods. Those visits, which are certainly very useful, could perhaps benefit from being more flexible

and focused on specific objectives and the main concerns of the countries visited.

With regard to the 1540 Committee, we welcome the considerable increase in the number of countries that have submitted their initial reports. We of course encourage countries that have not yet done so to meet their obligations under the resolution. It is also important that Member States continue to cooperate with the Committee, especially as regards providing the required reports and additional information.

Given the great importance of this issue that concerns us all, my delegation would like to propose the idea of having the three Committees hold regular joint briefings for all Member States. That would make for greater interaction with the Committees and all Member States, which could then have an exchange of experiences and information from which useful lessons could be learned. That would also ensure greater transparency in the Council's counter-terrorism efforts. Lastly, it would bring about better involvement by all Member States in combating international terrorism. Such an initiative is clearly useful and possible, as each Committee already holds annual public information meetings.

I would also like to thank and congratulate the 1267 Committee for the dialogue and open exchange it hosted yesterday, along with the representatives of Denmark, Liechtenstein, Sweden and Switzerland.

In conclusion, Burkina Faso encourages the participation of expert groups in the efforts of the United Nations system in the framework of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. We call for the strengthening and improvement of cooperation between regional and subregional organizations and United Nations bodies with the responsibility of combating terrorism. In that regard, it is important to note that the African Centre for the Study and Research on Terrorism, located in Algiers, is an excellent vehicle for, and good example of, cooperation between United Nations and African Union bodies.

Mr. Mantovani (Italy): Let me first express our heartfelt congratulations to you, Sir, and to the British delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. Allow me also to thank and commend the South African delegation for its stewardship during the month of April. We also wish to underscore our gratitude to the Chairs of the three subsidiary bodies of the Security Council for their

comprehensive briefings and contributions to the joint efforts against international terrorism. We also welcome their initiative to increase mutual cooperation so as to maximize synergy, avoid duplication and lower the burden on Member States.

While aligning itself with the statement to be delivered shortly on behalf of the presidency of the European Union, Italy will limit its remarks to the following few points.

I would like warmly to thank Ambassador Verbeke, who will soon leave his position as Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) — a task he fulfilled with great precision, responsibility and leadership.

The briefing we heard a few minutes ago gave us just a sampling of the many activities of the 1267 Committee. The sanctions list continues to be an essential tool in the fight against international terrorism. It is important that, with the continued support of the wider membership, it be constantly updated as a living document corresponding to the ever-present threat of Al-Qaida and the Taliban. We believe that improving the quality of the consolidated list should be one of the key priorities of the Sanctions Committee. That is because only complete identifiers and a regular update of the list can provide Member States with the precise information needed to more effectively apply the sanctions regime that has been established.

We acknowledge that legal challenges have been raised to the sanctions list at the national and international levels and that the Committee and the Council have the responsibility to do everything reasonable to improve the handling of specific cases. We see the merit of the Security Council continuing on the path of improving existing procedures, as was done in the recent past with resolutions 1730 (2006) and 1735 (2006), so as to reconcile security demands with respect for fundamental rights.

We would also like to express our utmost gratitude for the high professional skills shown throughout these years by the Monitoring Team, whose contribution to the general debate on sanctions is all the more relevant, and we look forward to the negotiations for the renewal of its mandate.

The Security Council has recently renewed the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Executive

Directorate (CTED) confirming its main tasks and responsibilities, while endorsing the reorganization plan, which lays the groundwork for more efficient action. To that end, Italy truly appreciates all the efforts made by the Executive Director, Mr. Smith. We hope that, with more focused action, the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and CTED can better exploit their role and potential as instruments of dialogue with Member States. We also have to reinforce every opportunity to better coordinate international cooperation with donors, other partners — such as the Security Council Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1540 (2004) — and their groups of experts, as well as all the participants in the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force.

We further encourage CTC and CTED to continue to work with external organizations, such as the Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG) of the G8. Italy is committed to strengthening such cooperation during its presidency of the G8 next year. In that area, we welcome the methodology introduced by CTED, successfully implemented during the 17 April Tokyo meeting with CTAG, aimed at identifying with the G8 presidency specific cases, countries, regions or themes of mutual interest to be jointly discussed. That methodology should contribute to the prevention of duplication and overlapping in the provision of technical assistance to interested countries.

Italy welcomes the recent adoption of resolution 1810 (2008), which renews the 1540 Committee's mandate for three more years. We support the new emphasis placed on the need to step up efforts to promote the full implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), in particular through outreach activities and international assistance. To that end, the sharing of experience and lessons learned between the 1540 Committee, the membership and relevant international and regional organizations will be crucial. Enhancing cooperation between the 1540 Committee and the Al-Qaida and Counter-Terrorism Committees will also be essential to ensuring compliance with resolution 1540 (2004).

We look forward to fruitful discussions within the 1540 Committee on how to make the best use of and improve existing funding mechanisms to assist States in meeting their non-proliferation obligations. We also look forward to the next comprehensive review of the

status of implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), due by January 31 2009.

Let me conclude by saying a few words about the September review of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Several initiatives have already been produced in the framework of the Strategy. Member States have a responsibility to continue on that track in order to achieve progress in all areas of the broad plan of action that was approved with the Strategy. We welcome the Task Force's efforts thus far to achieve specific goals in many important areas, and we appreciate the contribution that both the Monitoring Team and CTED have provided. Italy feels that those joint efforts should continue and, if possible, be strengthened. We look forward to the briefing that the Task Force and its working groups will provide in the near future.

Ms. Qwabe (South Africa): I, too, would like to thank the Chairpersons of the three Committees for their informative briefings.

I will make a few general remarks that are applicable to all three committees and some specific comments on the resolution that was recently adopted renewing the mandate of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004).

The Chairmen of the three committees are making noteworthy efforts to ensure that there is better coordination between the Committees, as well as between their experts. Joint visits by the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) and the Monitoring Team of the Al-Qaida/Taliban Committee help to prevent duplication. However, the issue of duplication can be adequately addressed only by the adoption of decisions by the Security Council that would further consolidate the work of the Committees.

Improving transparency in the work of the three subsidiary bodies is very important. If Members continue to be in the dark on important processes that directly affect them, it will merely perpetuate distrust of the Council. Open briefings and direct meetings between the subsidiary bodies and Member States, such as those that have already been held, are important measures to clarify issues and to improve transparency.

The Chairmen also briefed the Council on their work in the promotion of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. The Global Strategy is an

attempt by the United Nations membership as a whole to address the scourge of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, as well as to identify the conditions conducive to its spread. It is therefore important that the three subsidiary bodies complement the implementation of the Global Strategy, and we have noted significant progress in that regard since the Strategy's adoption.

I would now like to make some specific comments with regard to the 1540 Committee.

I would like to begin by reiterating South Africa's firm conviction that weapons of mass destruction do not guarantee security, but rather detract from it. As long as those weapons exist, the world will always face the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Non-proliferation and disarmament are mutually reinforcing processes. We therefore welcome the fact that the recently adopted resolution 1810 (2008) includes language on disarmament, arms control and the right to the peaceful uses of nuclear, chemical and biological technology, within appropriate safeguards.

South Africa shares the international community's concerns regarding the existence of networks dealing in the illicit transfer of nuclear-related technology and believes that closer international cooperation is necessary to root out the phenomenon of the illicit trade in technology that could be used in the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction. Our experience with illicit networks, in which South Africa is the only country amongst many affected countries to successfully prosecute suspects thus far, suggests that there is considerable room for improvement, also in the most developed countries, with regard to international cooperation and enforcement machineries.

That experience has prompted us to insist on the inclusion of language on networks in the current resolution. It is clear that the greatest threat posed by weapons of mass destruction and related technologies, materials, financing and delivery systems falling into the hands of non-State actors originates from the States that possess or are capable of possessing such weapons, and from countries with an advanced industrial base.

With its mandate extended through resolution 1810 (2008), the immediate challenge for the 1540 Committee will be to develop a balanced programme of work that will address the real challenges at the heart

of the proliferation risks posed by non-State actors, such as how the international community should respond to illicit proliferation networks.

Mr. Ettalhi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I am pleased at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We will strive to cooperate most positively with you. We also express our high appreciation for South Africa's effective leadership of the Security Council in April.

We thank Mr. Jurica, Mr. Verbeke and Mr. Urbina, Chairmen, respectively, of the Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1373 (2001), 1267 (1999) and 1540 (2004), for their valuable briefings. We highly appreciate their efforts to ensure the Committees' success.

The progress achieved by the sanctions Committees in promoting national counter-terrorism capacities, implementing the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and fulfilling international transparency commitments can only enjoy our support as a very important step towards eradicating both the causes and the symptoms of terrorism.

Our unanimous determination to reject any justification for terrorism cannot be at the expense of dealing objectively with the causes of terrorism. Occupation, the levelling of accusations against civilizations and cultures, the denial of the legitimacy of resistance to occupation and the application of double standards in the implementation of international instruments: those all give rise to much anger and violence.

With respect to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001), we have no doubt that the large number of Preliminary Implementation Assessments (PIAs) that have been adopted, as noted by the Chairman in his briefing, reflect the easing of demands on States to update their reports. We all hope that the new PIA matrices devised by the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate will reflect every State's performance in keeping with the criteria of transparency and objectivity and will take account of human rights issues. We hope that the overall review of resolution 1373 (2001), which is expected to be included in the Committee's next report to the Council, will be accurate, cautious and realistic and will avoid hasty classifications.

Turning to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) — the Al-Qaida and Taliban Sanctions Committee — Libya considers that there is a great need to improve the criteria for adding and removing names from the consolidated list, with a view to enhancing the accuracy and completeness of the list. We believe that the Committee should set criteria and terms for the submission of names for inclusion on the list, including the provision of accurate information on the individuals or entities in question. Libya stresses that our measures should be just and that the work of the Committee should focus on human rights; this would enhance the effectiveness of the implementation of the sanctions regime established under resolution 1267 (1999).

We therefore appreciate the Council's adoption of resolution 1735 (2006), which establishes coordination mechanisms to handle requests for the removal of names from the consolidated list, as a very important step towards improving the sanctions regime and increasing its transparency. We believe, however, that this step is not enough and that it does not meet the need for transparency in guaranteeing justice and clarity in these sanctions measures. We urge the Committee to continue to implement the provisions of resolution 1452 (2002) regarding exemptions, with a view to easing the severity of the sanctions on listed individuals and their families and addressing the humanitarian difficulties they may be facing. Here, we stress that the Committee should consider the obstacles that impede speedy action on requests for exemptions, in particular the use of delays and holds to stymie such requests.

With respect to the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004), Libya once again denounces the existence of weapons of mass destruction. We are convinced that the only guarantee against access by non-State actors to such weapons is their total elimination. Libya therefore believes that the goals of disarmament and non-proliferation are mutually supportive; continuous, irreversible progress must be made on both fronts. Libya believes it important to ensure that there is no contradiction among the provisions of resolution 1540 (2004), the United Nations Charter, existing multilateral treaties on weapons of mass destruction, other instruments adopted within international organizations in this sphere, and the role of the General Assembly.

We believe that the important issue of preventing weapons of mass destruction from falling into the hands of non-State actors requires the active participation of all Member States. We believe that the subject should be considered in the General Assembly with a view to agreement on a legally binding instrument on this issue.

In conclusion, Libya once again reaffirms its support for all international counter-terrorism efforts and its support for all efforts to reach the international community's goal of eradicating terrorism and bringing about a world of peace and security for all.

Mr. Lacroix (France) (*spoke in French*): I wish at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, and the United Kingdom delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. My thanks go to Ambassador Kumalo and the South African delegation for their very effective work last month.

I thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this meeting to hear briefings by the Chairmen of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, the Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee and the Committee on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to non-State actors. The Council should continue to follow the work of these Committees attentively and to encourage good interaction and exchanges of experience among them, in conformity with their respective mandates, as it has recently done through resolutions 1805 (2008) and 1810 (2008). We welcome the progress on this point and the issuance of a statement to the press on the initiative of Ambassadors Jurica, Urbina and Verbeke — whom I thank for their briefings this morning.

The Permanent Representative of Slovenia will soon make a comprehensive statement on behalf of the European Union, to which, clearly, my country fully subscribes. I wish now to emphasize a number of elements that my delegation views as particularly important.

The Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) is a very important part of our counter-terrorism and non-proliferation machinery. France hopes that it will successfully attain all of the objectives set in its programme of work. The biennial experts' report — to whose finalization by the Committee my delegation is looking forward — should show significant progress in the implementation of the resolution.

But a great deal remains to be done. Some 40 States have yet to report. National reports still show weaknesses in several key areas: the biological segment is almost entirely in progress; gaps remain in the fight against the financing of proliferation and the control of transport and of sensitive exports.

That is why France has been actively engaged in updating the Committee's mandate. With resolution 1810 (2008), a qualitative leap forward should be possible on assistance to States requiring it; that is one of the most promising areas for the future. The extension of the mandate will make it possible to better plan and finance assistance activities. The Committee has received very clear instructions to play an active role in coordinating offers of and requests for assistance. Many practical provisions were included in the resolution to facilitate this.

The Committee is also mandated to promote the sharing of experience that would be useful for the implementation of the resolution. This is of great importance, because many States have requested specific examples.

Finally, resolution 1810 (2008) provides explicitly for the possibility of visits by the Committee to countries in order to heighten awareness and offer assistance.

Neither these provisions nor the extension of the mandate constitute a blank cheque. The resolution provides for regular meetings with the Security Council and increased dialogue with interested States, which will further bolster the legitimacy of the resolution. The provisions sketch a road map for the future. Three years will not be excessive: it is essential for the Committee to get under way as quickly as possible in order to fully implement the mandate entrusted to it. In the short term, it should adopt its biennial report without delay. It should then ensure that its mandate is faithfully and fully reflected in its programme of work, and it should spare no effort in helping States to implement the resolution.

As our colleague, the Permanent Representative of Croatia, has just recalled, the Council adopted resolution 1805 (2008) of 20 March, renewing the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) and endorsing the revised organizational plan of the Directorate, which plays an essential role in supporting the Counter-Terrorism Committee. We spoke of this in March (see

S/PV.5855), and I shall not revisit the issue. I wish merely to highlight three fundamental aspects of the Counter-Terrorism Committee on which there has been progress in recent months.

My first point relates to the need to ensure coherence. The Committee must use identical criteria during its assessments of the data made available by States. This does not however mean automating a system which must take careful account of the distinct features of each country.

My second point relates to the importance of dialogue. The Committee carries out visits, adopts Preliminary Implementation Assessments and participates, through the Executive Directorate, in numerous international meetings regarding various aspects of the fight against terrorism. There is a need to make use of these channels for dialogue to meet the simple but far-reaching objective of raising the level of counter-terrorist means available to States and to achieve the fullest and broadest possible implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). We must work together to build a bastion against terrorism.

My last point relates to the multiplying effect of other agencies or organizations active in combating terrorism. This is particularly true regarding the participation of the Executive Directorate in the Secretary-General's Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, and the numerous meetings held with specialized bodies such as the Financial Action Task Force, the International Civil Aviation Organization and the Counter-Terrorism Action Group. The Counter-Terrorism Committee should be at the core of a network of partner entities. Here, the European Union has already responded to this appeal.

I would not wish to conclude without saying a word on the 1267 Committee and, above all, without paying a tribute to the work of Ambassador Verbeke, who has done a great deal to strengthen the effectiveness of the sanctions regime in all its aspects.

The first aspect is the adaptation of the list to the nature of the threat. This effort is reflected in the de-listing of certain entries which no longer met the criteria of association with Osama bin Laden, Al-Qaida or the Taliban. New names have also been added. This flexibility of the list is critical and we need to preserve it. The Committee has begun the essential task of updating the entries on the list in order to identify

wrong, incomplete or outdated entries. A particular effort should be made regarding deceased individuals.

The second aspect relates to monitoring the implementation of the regime. It is up to the Committee and its Chairman to identify cases of non-compliance with the sanctions and to deal with them appropriately. At the same time, the work of explaining the parameters of these obligations, as is being carried out in particular through the Committee's Internet site, is also pivotal. This necessary vigilance regarding the implementation of sanctions goes hand in hand with the related task of ensuring the quality and reliability of the information on the list.

The third and final aspect relates to the improvement of procedures to make them clearer and more transparent. Thus, the Committee has adopted a standard form for requests for de-listing; it has updated its procedures regarding exemptions to assets freezing; and it is doing similar work regarding exemptions to the travel ban. These efforts benefit from the robust and credible nature of the sanctions regime and must be encouraged.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that, taken together, these three Committees form the core of the Security Council's response to the grave threat to international peace and security posed by terrorism, proliferation and the convergence of those threats. We have reaffirmed on numerous occasions in this Chamber, and together with the Security Council, that terrorism is criminal and unjustifiable. This is particularly true of Al-Qaida and of its associates, who have targeted not only States on all continents, but also the United Nations itself, as in Algiers last 11 December. Allow me once again to pay tribute to the memory of the victims and to their families, and to reaffirm France's unswerving determination to thwart the designs of terrorists wherever they may be active.

Mr. Natalegawa (Indonesia): My delegation too wishes to congratulate you, Sir, and the delegation of the United Kingdom on your assumption of the presidency for this month. We also wish to thank South Africa and to congratulate it on its able stewardship of the Council last month.

My delegation appreciates the important briefing by the Chairmen of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), the 1267 Committee and the 1540 Committee. We would like to express our appreciation to the

Chairmen for their able leadership of the work of those Committees.

Today's briefings clearly reflect the significance of the close cooperation among the three Committees dealing with counter-terrorism issues. We are of the view that this cooperation will not only be crucial for the work of the Committees, but also will be essential for synergy and coherence in the Council's contribution to countering the threat posed by terrorism. To this end, my delegation recalls the intention of the Council to provide guidance to the three Committees on areas of common interest in order to better coordinate counter-terrorism efforts stipulated in resolution 1805 (2008).

With regard to the briefing on the Counter-Terrorism Committee, we duly note the Committee's accomplishments on several key initiatives, which will serve as a sound basis for its future work. My delegation is of the view that the revised organizational plan could strengthen the role of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) to enhance the CTC's ability to monitor the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). We share the view that the recommendations contained in the organizational plan could consolidate the achievements of CTED, and could eventually intensify the work of the CTC.

My delegation recognizes the significance of the adoption of Preliminary Implementation Assessments (PIAs) as a tool to intensify dialogue between the CTC and Member States on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). PIAs are dynamic documents, and we hope that the CTC will continue to further improve the consistency and accuracy of their content. On the issue of a revised version of the "Survey of the implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) by Member States", we would like to underline the need for the CTC to present a more accurate picture in finalizing the survey.

On the implementation of resolution 1624 (2005), my delegation reiterates the importance of CTED's support for the work of the CTC in ensuring comprehensive implementation of the resolution. For its part, Indonesia actively continues its efforts to promote cultural dialogue, tolerance and mutual understanding with religious communities and among civilizations.

With regard to the briefing on the 1267 Committee, I would like to use this opportunity to

reiterate our strong commitment to the promotion of the effective implementation of the sanctions regime adopted under resolution 1267 (1999) by improving the quality of the consolidated list. We are of the view that our joint efforts to improve the quality of the consolidated list, particularly through enhancing its completeness and accuracy, should contribute generally to the effectiveness of the implementation of resolution 1267 (1999). In this context, my delegation fully supports the intention of the Committee to evaluate the review mechanism of the consolidated list, as provided for in paragraph 6 (i) of the Committee's guidelines.

While fully supporting the effort to identify possible cases of non-compliance, my delegation maintains its view that the Council, in considering the compliance of Member States, should also take into account their achievements in combating Al-Qaida and its affiliates through robust national criminal law enforcement. The problem of non-compliance may be caused not only by lack of political will or insufficient understanding of the sanctions regime, but also by legal deficiencies of procedure applicable to the listing and de-listing processes. My delegation therefore is of the view that the Security Council should give its utmost and urgent attention to the issue of further improving fair and clear procedure. We are convinced that addressing this issue will also improve and promote effective implementation of the regime at the national level.

Turning to the briefing on the 1540 Committee, I would like to reassert Indonesia's support for the main tasks of the Committee, namely promoting global capacity and raising international standards for implementing the resolution. We are also pleased to note that the Council, through resolution 1810 (2008), has extended the mandate of the Committee for a period of three years.

Since the full implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) is a long-term objective and an ongoing process, we hope that in its future work the Committee will continue to place priority on dialogue and cooperation with Member States on their need to fulfil their obligations under the resolution. In this regard, my delegation stresses that the responsibility for implementation of the resolution rests fully with national Governments, whereas international and regional organizations can continue to assist them upon their request and needs.

Finally, my delegation reiterates the importance of continued and strengthened cooperation among the 1267, Counter-Terrorism and 1540 Committees. My delegation would also like to underline that full implementation of resolutions 1267 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004) can be effectively carried out through continuous efforts, patience, dialogue, cooperation and assistance.

The President: I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of the United Kingdom.

I would like to join others in thanking Ambassadors Verbeke, Jurica and Urbina for their briefings to the Council this morning. I would like to thank not only them, but also their staffs and the expert groups of each Committee, for their time and commitment. Ambassador Verbeke's leadership of the 1267 Committee will be much missed.

On the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee the United Kingdom welcomes the revised organizational plan for the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) and the adoption of Security Council resolution 1805 (2008) extending the Directorate's mandate. We welcome the renewed emphasis on tailored dialogue between States and the Counter-Terrorism Committee and, in particular, the need for increased focus on the delivery of technical assistance as key to full implementation of resolution 1373 (2001).

We look forward to early progress on the global survey of the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) that is under discussion in the Counter-Terrorism Committee. This will be the first substantive report from the Committee on the strengths and weaknesses in our collective efforts to tackle terrorism, and on what more needs to be done. We look forward to considering the report's recommendations here in the Security Council.

On the 1267 Committee, the United Kingdom believes that we need to improve the quality of the consolidated list of the Al-Qaida and Taliban Sanctions Committee. The list must reflect the current threat. Its legitimacy depends on the quality and extent of the information within it. We must continue to update the list at every opportunity and ensure our procedures for listing and de-listing are efficient and effective. At present, they are not. Our ability to remove individuals that no longer meet the criteria is as important as

listing additional names that do. Additionally, I would like to reinforce the importance of cooperation between the 1267 Committee, the Monitoring Team, Member States and regional and international organizations. We hope that this cooperation continues to grow.

The United Kingdom welcomes the extension of the mandate of the 1540 Committee, in particular the clear focus on capacity-building and sharing of know-how. The unanimous adoption of resolution 1810 (2008) sends a strong signal of the international community's determination to ensure that weapons of mass destruction do not fall into the hands of criminals, terrorists and would-be proliferators. We look forward to early agreement on the Committee's report on compliance with resolution 1540 (2004).

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Slovenia, to whom I give the floor.

Ms. Štiglic (Slovenia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU). The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) country Norway, member of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine and Armenia, align themselves with this declaration.

At the outset, let me congratulate you, Sir, upon your assumption of the presidency for the month of May. I would also like to thank South Africa for its stewardship of the Council in the previous month.

The European Union is pleased to participate in today's debate. Due to time limitations, the EU will shorten its statement. The full version is being distributed and constitutes our official statement.

We welcome the briefings from the Chairmen of the three Committees. These Committees play an important role in the work of the United Nations in countering the terrorist threat. We appreciate the opportunity to hear more about their work as part of an open and transparent debate.

Terrorism is a global threat that requires a global and comprehensive response. The EU reiterates once again that terrorism constitutes one of the most serious

threats to international peace and security, and that any acts of terrorism are criminal and unjustifiable. The EU is convinced that any measures taken to fight this scourge must be in accordance with obligations under international law in particular international human rights law, refugee law, and international humanitarian law. Effective counter-terrorism measures and the protection of human rights are not conflicting, but rather complementary and mutually reinforcing, goals. Our action must be firmly based on due process and the rule of law.

The EU would like to welcome efforts by the three Security Council Committees and their expert groups to enhance coherence and avoid duplication. Further, the EU would highly encourage the expert bodies of the Security Council Committees to continue enhancing their mutual cooperation. A coordinated approach will not only prevent duplication of work but also help maximize resources and ensure synergy in Security Council counter-terrorism work.

We commend the 1267 Committee for the considerable progress made with regard to improving the effectiveness of the Al-Qaida and Taliban sanctions regime. In doing so, the Committee was supported in an effective manner by the Monitoring Team. We welcome the issuance of the seventh report of the Monitoring Team as an official United Nations document (see S/2007/677) containing relevant analysis and recommendations that will further improve the effectiveness of the Committee's work. We also look forward to receiving the eighth report of the Monitoring Team.

The EU welcomes the continued determination of the Committee to improve procedures for listing, notification and de-listing of individuals and entities, to keep the consolidated list updated and to enhance public outreach and the efforts undertaken to implement these objectives. The EU has always emphasized the need to strengthen fair and clear procedures for placing individuals and entities on sanctions lists and for removing them, in order to enhance the effectiveness of targeted sanctions.

In addition, the EU welcomes the decision of the 1267 Committee to address the problems in implementing the sanctions regime due to a lack of identifiers. Addressing these problems and providing additional identifiers will enhance the accuracy and

quality of the list itself, thereby strengthening the effectiveness and credibility of the sanctions regime.

In this regard, we welcome the decision of the Committee to continue to review and update the list and to consider which elements of its methodology could be improved. The Committee's decision to update a number of the tools and documents related to the consolidated list and to enhance dialogue between the Committee and States by creating a tool for voluntary, informal reporting will further improve its work.

The EU recognizes the need to bring the consolidated list to wider attention, in particular to the attention of financial institutions. We believe that, in doing so, it would be useful to add more information to the list as to the primary reason for listing. We welcome the decision of the Committee to separate section E of the list from the rest of the list.

We note that the Monitoring Team has reported some cases of non-compliance with the obligations under the sanctions regimes. In this respect, the EU welcomes the fact that the Committee has developed a methodology to identify possible cases of non-compliance and to address them in the most appropriate way. We look forward to the development of specific and general recommendations on what can be done to prevent the occurrence of such cases.

As regards the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), the EU welcomes the adoption of Security Council resolution 1805 (2008), which extended the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED). The European Union recognizes the crucial role of CTED in supporting the CTC in the fulfilment of its mandate. The effective continuation of CTED's work of facilitating capacity-building and advising the CTC on issues of implementation, including legal and technical issues, will enhance the CTC's ability to monitor implementation of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005).

The European Union welcomes and fully supports the organizational plan for CTED prepared by its Executive Director, approved by the Counter-Terrorism Committee and endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 1805 (2008). The EU believes that the revised organizational plan provides an excellent basis for CTED's future work.

The EU supports additional briefings to States and further visits to selected States, with their consent. These briefings and visits provide a means of direct communication and of listening to the suggestions and concerns of States. They also provide for better understanding of all that sanctions regimes can offer to assist States in their fight against terrorism.

The EU welcomes the work put forward by the Committee in preparing the Preliminary Implementation Assessments within the framework of resolution 1373 (2001). We welcome the decision of the Counter-Terrorism Committee to reassess the status of implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) by all States and to report its findings to the Council. We look forward to seeing the results of the global survey of implementation, which will provide valuable information for the further work in the fight against terrorism.

The EU welcomes the adoption of Security Council resolution 1810 (2008) and is encouraged by the extension of the mandate of the 1540 Committee until April 2011, as well as by its enhancement. The EU commends the work of the 1540 Committee and its role in addressing the threat to international peace and security posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, the EU believes that the efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including to non-State actors, must be strengthened and intensified.

The EU is keen to see the Committee strengthen its role as a clearing house for facilitating technical assistance to help countries achieve full implementation of all aspects of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004). The EU also believes that a longer, three-year mandate will be key to ensuring better planning and funding of assistance. Country-specific outreach events, now explicitly authorized under the resolution, are also a promising development.

The EU remains fully committed to lending its full support to the work of the 1540 Committee in order to promote the universal implementation of resolution 1540 (2004). We are in the process of preparing a new Joint Action, within the framework of the implementation of the EU Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, to support the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), which will reflect the new tasks and priorities identified in resolution 1810 (2008).

In that respect, the EU believes that making better and broader use of voluntary funding for the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) is essential, and we look forward to the forthcoming proposals of the 1540 Committee in that regard. The EU looks forward to the 1540 Committee's presentation of a comprehensive report to the Security Council no later than 31 July 2008, as requested in resolution 1810 (2008).

To conclude, I would like once again to thank the Chairmen of the three Committees for their work. The EU will continue to promote universal adherence to the conventions and protocols forming the legal basis for the work of the United Nations in countering the terrorist threat, and we will continue to support their global implementation. We commend the work of the Security Council as a vital component in the efforts of the United Nations to combat the terrorist scourge, which is a threat to all States and to all peoples.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Cuba, to whom I now give the floor.

Mr. Malmierca Díaz (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the delegation of Cuba, Sir, I wish you every success in the presidency of the Security Council for the month of May. I also take this opportunity to offer special congratulations to the Permanent Representative of South Africa and his entire team for the excellent work accomplished during the month of April. In addition, I wish to thank the Chairmen of the Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004) for the information provided at this meeting.

For years, as everyone knows, our country has been submitting to the Security Council detailed information about the terrorist actions committed against Cuba by various individuals and organizations and about the complicit protection provided to them by the Government of the United States. On many occasions, we have spoken in this Chamber and sent letters to the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Security Council, denouncing specific cases of flagrant violations of resolution 1373 (2001). Unfortunately, nothing has been done so far.

This very week, 8 May will mark the first anniversary of the permanent release in the United States of the terrorist Luis Posada Carriles, who is rightly considered to be the most notorious terrorist in

the Western Hemisphere. Despite the fact that the Government of the United States itself has acknowledged that he is a dangerous terrorist, and despite all the evidence of its long relationship with him at its disposal and provided by Cuba since 1998, Posada Carriles was charged by United States authorities with only minor immigration crimes.

The release of that terrorist and former agent of the Central Intelligence Agency demonstrates that his insignificant trial in the United States was a farce. One need only read the news to see that Posada Carriles freely walks the streets of that country, making press statements to anyone who will listen, and is honoured and recognized in Miami for his terrorist acts against Cuba. Nothing more need be said.

Cuba is appearing once again in the Security Council to strongly denounce and condemn the complicit inaction of the Government of the United States and the protection that it is providing to Posada Carriles. While it insists on presenting itself as the leader of its self-proclaimed "war on terror", the Government of the United States continues to ignore the request for Posada Carrile's extradition filed on 15 June 2005 by the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

The Government of Cuba demands once again that Washington return the terrorist to Venezuela or try him on its own territory, in conformity with article 7 of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation.

The Government of the United States has even had the nerve to allege that it cannot hand Posada Carriles over to Venezuela or Cuba because he is in danger of being tortured. This falsehood is even more outrageous when one considers that the accusing Government is precisely the one that is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of civilians in Iraq; that authorized the torture at Abu Ghraib and at the Guantánamo naval base, a part of Cuban territory illegally occupied by the United States; and that is an accomplice in kidnappings, disappearances, secret flights and clandestine prisons.

While confessed and unscrupulous terrorists walk free, the Government of the United States holds hostage in high-security prisons five young Cubans who were only trying, with great altruism and courage, to obtain information about Miami-based terrorist groups in order to prevent their violent acts and to save

the lives of Cuban and United States citizens. Once again, Cuba demands the immediate release of Gerardo Hernández, Ramón Labañino, Fernando González, Antonio Guerrero and René González. For fighting terrorism, our five heroes will have served 10 years of unjust and cruel imprisonment in United States prisons on 12 September 2008.

Cuba reiterates its request to the Security Council and its Counter-Terrorism Committee to urgently address the detailed information that our country has provided them and to take all measures necessary under the relevant resolutions. Double standards cannot prevail. The Security Council cannot continue to maintain a complicit silence in the face of this gross affront to the victims of terrorism throughout the world. It will be impossible to eliminate terrorism if some terrorist acts are condemned while others are ignored, tolerated or justified, or if the issue is simply manipulated to promote narrow political interests.

Cuba has never permitted, nor will it ever permit, its territory to be used for terrorist actions against any State, without exception. As always, we shall continue to strongly fight terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. As it has always done, Cuba will continue to abide strictly by Security Council resolutions 1267 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004) and will maintain its cooperation with the subsidiary bodies established pursuant to them.

Mr. President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of India, to whom I now give the floor.

Mr. Sen (India): At the outset, please accept my felicitations, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are happy to participate in today's joint debate on three Security Council items, whose implementation requires not only the fullest collective effort by the entire membership, but also their fullest participation in processes that affect the collective security of all nations equally. I will limit my remarks to a few comments, proceeding from my last statement on this subject, in March this year, before this body (see S/PV.5855).

To begin with, let me reaffirm India's abiding determination to work to conclude the long-pending effort to finalize a comprehensive convention on international terrorism, moving beyond debates that essentially miss the larger point. Such a convention must be agreed upon to create a strong interlocking

network of Member States, international organizations and specialized agencies working in unison to counter terrorism. The adoption of such a convention through the exercise of the lawmaking powers of the General Assembly would be in the interests of all Member States and would reinvigorate the multilateral and collective dimensions of counter-terrorism efforts. India continues to call upon the world to act as one in denying terrorists, their ideologues and their financiers access to arms, funds and means of transportation for their deadly goods, as well as safe havens.

If those overarching goals are to be achieved, there is also a need for a more genuinely inclusive approach to be adopted by the Security Council, taking along the larger membership of the General Assembly. While India remains committed to fully cooperating with all existing counter-terrorism mechanisms, as a State with long experience in dealing with terrorism, we are of the view that better cooperation between the Council and the General Assembly will provide our collective efforts greater legitimacy and ownership.

There are also operational benefits to be achieved from greater collective pragmatism in tackling terrorism through multilateral mechanisms. Not the least of those potential benefits is better implementation of the resolutions relating to counter-terrorism, namely resolutions 1267 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004) and their successor resolutions.

However, to reach that stage of pragmatic, goal-based cooperation, we need to do much more than we have done thus far. It is also unclear whether better implementation of those resolutions can be secured by upgrading their existing mandates, as in the recent case of resolution 1810 (2008), or by working to identify genuine barriers to better implementation and promoting a more collaborative system of extending assistance and utilizing available regional expertise and appropriate technologies. Implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), including reporting, remains a national responsibility on the basis of national legislation, arrangements and regulations. There may also be merit in an approach that provides incentives for cooperation rather than the current effort to continually raise the bar for implementation by adding newer and more intrusive reporting obligations, irrespective of whether those are currently described as voluntary tasks.

That apart, however, I also wish to reiterate at this juncture India's continuing emphasis on the need for closer and more comprehensive international cooperation to root out the phenomenon of illicit activities such as clandestine proliferation of sensitive technologies, which could contribute to the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction.

The Security Council should also consider whether its existing procedures need some overhauling, in particular with regard to the sanctions regime imposed upon Al-Qaida and Taliban operatives, entities and their supporters. While at one level the effort to improve modalities for review and delisting is to be welcomed, there is also a need for the Council to examine its own practice of selectively evaluating the provision of information that it seeks from Member States, which, for unrelated and procedural reasons, is sometimes not utilized.

With regard to the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED), we are encouraged by the positive efforts of the dynamic new Executive Director. Greater dialogue and consultation with all Member States and better operational coordination with the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force is the correct way forward for a mechanism that eventually has a larger responsibility to the entire membership of the United Nations.

Ultimately, we will collectively benefit from the furtherance of the ongoing process of making the CTED a completely professional, apolitical body that goes beyond analysis of reports. However, the CTED can only transcend the minutiae of examining reports and preliminary implementation assessments once it is no longer perceived as a largely political body, but as an apolitical, professional organization.

In conclusion, I would venture the following suggestions.

Better coordination between the various arms of the Council's counter-terrorism mechanism must begin at home. In other words, inter-related aspects of the work of the 1267 Committee, the 1540 Committee and the CTC should be dovetailed with those of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. Those tasks should also be more closely linked with the core tasks of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, INTERPOL, the International Civil Aviation

Organization, the International Maritime Organization and others.

While supporting the greater emphasis on the extension of technical assistance bilaterally, regionally and internationally, we should keep in mind the primary task of ensuring the fullest implementation of the relevant Council resolutions before we take the process forward to more technical and potentially intrusive areas of implementation that may add to the sense of report fatigue among many Member States.

India remains willing to provide all assistance in the larger effort to counter the threat of terrorism. Our commitment to do so is already on record, in India's fifth report, submitted to the CTC in March 2007. We are willing to share information with other relevant United Nations mechanisms that work in those fields. Such assistance can be provided by India bilaterally or multilaterally, especially to countries that are themselves not directly threatened by terrorism but whose participation is vital to the success of the larger international effort.

Our comments here today are in the spirit of pressing for further forward movement in bringing existing mechanisms to deal with terrorism closer together in operational terms. We welcome more efforts to use such open dialogues as a mechanism to build closer cooperation within the international system. We therefore look forward to working in a pragmatic manner to alter the regrettable perception outside these walls that the role of the United Nations in combating terrorism is limited to statements and speeches and does not include concrete measures. For that, we must not only work to foster better institutional cooperation and "jointedness" — if I may use the word — within the international system, we must also focus on implementing goals that can be achieved before mandating new and potentially challenging commitments.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Japan.

Mr. Takasu (Japan): First of all, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of May and express my deep appreciation to you for convening today's debate. I would also like to thank the Chairs of the Council's three counter-terrorism committees for their respective briefings.

The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy sets out the shared understanding among Member States on how to address the common threat of terrorism. In order to implement the Strategy, most importantly, each Member State must strengthen its national counter-terrorism capacity and promote international cooperation as a matter of urgency. As the Chair of the G8 this year, Japan places high priority on building national capacities to combat terrorism and organized crime, and we are making great efforts to achieve that objective.

We highly value the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) in identifying specific needs for counter-terrorism technical assistance through site visits and preliminary implementation assessments. One of the major challenges is how to match appropriate supporters with the assistance needs identified by the CTED. For such matchmaking, well-focused dialogue among CTED, the CTC and Member States will be useful, as stated in paragraph 5 of resolution 1805 (2008). Japan, as the Chair of the Counter-Terrorism Action Group, is making every effort to promote effective coordination with the CTED. We are jointly striving to strengthen information-sharing in New York and to coordinate the best response to the counter-terrorism assistance requirements of concerned countries.

Japan also welcomes the readiness of CTED to participate actively in and support the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. We hope the CTED will make a significant contribution to the implementation of the Counter-Terrorism Strategy through its active participation in the Task Force and its working groups.

The Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities is playing a crucial role in that field. It is our view that its mandate should be extended beyond June, and we welcome the efforts made in improving the quality and procedures of its consolidated list. We encourage the Committee to continue that effort. Japan places great importance on de-radicalization as an essential element of counter-terrorism. We therefore appreciate the Committee's continuous engagement in the working group on de-radicalization under the Task Force.

Japan welcomes the recent decision of the Security Council to extend and enhance the mandate of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004). Japan sees the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) as a key element in our global efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Japan has taken an active initiative to promote the universalization of resolution 1540 (2004). As the Chair of the G8, it is our intention to promote the examination of how G8 countries can contribute further to the work of the 1540 Committee.

The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy review conference is slated for early September 2008. The Strategy is a valuable instrument for the Member States to work collectively in combating terrorism. The United Nations and its Member States must achieve greater cooperation to further advance global efforts. We have high expectations that the three subsidiary bodies of the Security Council will do their utmost to implement the Strategy. At the same time, it will be important for the three Committees to coordinate and streamline their activities and to avoid duplicating efforts in their visits and assessments of the reports submitted by the Member States. We would also appreciate it if the Committees could provide regular informal briefings, in addition to briefings such as this morning's, to ensure accountability and guidance to Member States.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Israel.

Mrs. Eilon Shahar (Israel): Allow to me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council this month and to thank you for convening this important debate. My delegation also congratulates the Chairpersons of the subsidiary bodies on their able stewardship and thanks them for their briefings this morning.

The struggle against terrorism is a global one and, as such, the United Nations has an important role to play in coordinating the efforts to combat that scourge. States must remain vigilant not only in meeting their obligations to prevent terrorism but also in providing support to those States that lack capacity. We therefore encourage enhanced cooperation with the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, subsidiary bodies of the Council and other relevant entities of the United Nations. We also stress the

importance of a comprehensive approach within the United Nations system to deal with the threat of terrorism and measures taken to address it. To that end, we look forward to the review of the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy this coming September.

While Israel has specifically experienced the threat of terrorism, it is well known that terrorism transcends geographical boundaries, borders and nations. It is therefore incumbent upon all States to adhere to their obligations under international law, including the relevant resolutions adopted by the Council, in particular resolution 1373 (2001). Some States not only neglect their responsibilities to enforce their borders and prevent the movement of terrorists; worse, they host, support and sponsor terrorism. The granting of safe haven to terrorists — as we see today in parts of our region — is a threat to international peace and security. The international community must press for an end to State support for, and sponsorship of, terrorism. Those States that lack the capacity to implement their international obligations should be assisted through the appropriate channels.

Resolution 1624 (2005) is part and parcel of the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED). We note the Chairperson's reference in this morning's briefing to the Committee's agreement to initiate discussions to explore the technical assistance needs of States in implementing that resolution. We emphasize the urgency and pressing need to address the implementation of resolution 1624 (2005) beyond States' reporting. We believe that no counter-terrorism strategy is complete without addressing the issue of incitement.

In March of this year, the Council extended the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate. We support that extension and the organizational change made within CTED, which allows for better quality, consistency and flexibility in its work. We appreciate the dialogue among the Executive Director, the Chairman and Member States. Those efforts have led to greater transparency and positive engagement with CTED. We look forward to their continuation.

Although nine years have passed since the Council adopted resolution 1267 (1999), the Committee's work and impact on countering terrorism

is more relevant than ever. Israel fully supports the work of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). We encourage efforts to ensure that fair and clear procedures continue to be utilized in the listing and de-listing process. We welcome the further consideration of how to improve and expand the procedures so that the lists remain imbued with quality and not merely quantity. At the same time, we note that much progress has been achieved under resolutions 1730 (2006) and 1735 (2006). In that regard, we look forward to the deliberations of the Council in the lead-up to the extension of the mandate next month.

On a related note, we support taking a fresh look at the working group established under paragraph 9 of resolution 1566 (2004) to consider and submit recommendations to the Council on practical measures to be imposed on individuals, groups or entities involved in, or associated with, terrorist activities, other than those designated by the Al-Qaida/Taliban Sanctions Committee.

Similarly, Israel supports resolution 1540 (2004) and believes it is a significant step towards the implementation of international standards against the threats of international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). We are committed to its full implementation, and we welcome resolution 1810 (2008), which extended the mandate of the 1540 Committee for three more years. In that context, allow me to briefly highlight some of Israel's national policies.

As a State facing conventional and non-conventional threats, including missiles and daily terrorism, Israel has taken legal and practical measures designed to prevent the proliferation of WMDs. Export controls have been put into practice through the adoption of the control lists of the Wassenaar Arrangement, the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Australia Group and the Nuclear Suppliers Group. That was effected by the entry into force, in January 2008, of Israel's Export Control Act. The list is updated in accordance with international standards.

Extensive counter-terrorism legislation exists in Israel. We are committed to act against any form of support for terrorism. Accordingly, we actively confront any attempt by non-State actors to develop, acquire, manufacture, possess, transport, transfer or use

nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and their means of delivery.

I wish to note that Israel's support for curbing the spread of weapons of mass destruction extends to other mechanisms and initiatives as well, including the Proliferation Security Initiative, the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, the Container Security Initiative and the United States Megaport Initiative.

As many know, Israel is a country that has been forced to live under the threat of terrorism, before its inception and since. The vast majority of Israelis have first-hand knowledge of the devastating effects of terrorism. For us, terrorism is not a technicality or abstract matter; it is a reality with devastating consequences for our civilian population. Israelis feel the threat of terrorism today, whether from the north, the south or the heartland. For that reason, Israel remains prepared to continue to work with the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council to advance its objectives and improve cooperation and engagement with other Member States. We appreciate this opportunity for dialogue and an exchange of ideas and are prepared to continue to do our part.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Ms. Lisson (Australia): Australia welcomes the opportunity to participate in today's debate and thanks the Chairmen of the three Committees for their briefings.

The comprehensive legal framework of the United Nations in the field of counter-terrorism is of fundamental importance in developing a global response to the evolving threat of terrorism. Australia strongly supports the work of the United Nations counter-terrorism Committees. We encourage close engagement by the Committees with the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force to ensure appropriate coordination, avoid duplication and encourage the effective implementation of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

Australia is focused on enhancing security and capacity-building efforts with partner countries to combat terrorism and prevent terrorist attacks. Regional counter-terrorism successes are continuing to have an impact on the primary terrorism threat to our region, namely, Jemaah Islamiyah. Australia remains

committed to working at all levels with Member States to overcome the grave threat to our security posed by terrorism.

Australia strongly supports the work of the Security Council's Counter-Terrorism Committee and its Executive Directorate. We also support the Committee in its efforts to monitor the implementation of counter-terrorism measures. We welcome the Directorate's engagement with donors active in the counter-terrorism field and its focus on matching donor capabilities with recipients' needs. Effective relationship-building between donor and recipient countries and a practical focus on capabilities and needs are critical for success.

Australia welcomes the steps being taken by the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) to engage more closely with Member States and regional bodies in order to better coordinate its work. That will be important if global counter-terrorism efforts are to be effective, as a strong legislative and regulatory framework is essential in disrupting terrorist networks and dealing with specific threats. Indeed, in March of this year, Australia significantly increased the maximum penalties under our legislation for terrorist offences.

Australia welcomes the unanimous adoption of resolution 1810 (2008) and encourages the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) to continue to build on its efforts of the past four years in support of the universal and effective implementation of the resolution. Australia in particular commends the Committee for seeking to promote and develop greater Asia-Pacific coordination and cooperation, including facilitating assistance to countries of the region.

As Chair of the Australia Group, we work with 40 other member Governments and the European Commission to strengthen the Group's control lists. Through outreach efforts, we complement the goals of resolution 1540 (2004) and that Committee's own outreach efforts. Australia will also chair the planning meeting of the 34-member Missile Technology Control Regime to be held in Canberra later this year. That will provide us with a further opportunity to contribute to strengthening international non-proliferation frameworks and norms.

Finally, Australia welcomes the emphasis — particularly in resolution 1810 (2008) — on enhancing ongoing cooperation between the 1540, 1267 and 1373

Committees. That will be particularly well received in the Asia-Pacific region, where countries are focused on cooperating in developing their counter-terrorism capabilities.

The President: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Adi (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of my country on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for May. I should also like to thank your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of South Africa, for his excellent guidance of the Council last month.

Moreover, I thank Ambassadors Verbeke, Urbina and Jurica, Chairmen of the sanctions Committees, for their briefings to the Council on the work of their Committees.

The millennia-long history of Syria is replete with examples of the authenticity and deep-rooted nature of its Arab traditions and of the Islamic and Christian influences on its rejection of extremism and fanaticism. Syria's history reflects its reliance on home-grown traditions and its acceptance of all cultures and civilizations and the religious and intellectual beliefs of others. My country has always been devoted to its ethical position of principle, despite the extreme changes that have occurred in the international situation and in the language used to describe those constant changes.

What has not changed is Syria's ongoing condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, regardless of the source or the perpetrators, be they individuals, groups or States. That is because terrorism is manifested in criminal acts of aggression that target innocent people, their lives and their property, in violation of the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and regional security of States. Terrorism knows neither nationality nor religion. It strikes indiscriminately, and no one can escape its horrors.

Terrorism is thus the very antithesis of all religions, races, nationalities and civilizations. It must be fought in the framework of international legitimacy, under the United Nations Charter and in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the provisions of international law.

The crimes that Israel has daily perpetrated for decades against the Arab people in the occupied Arab territories and the occupied Syrian Golan are an egregious example of State terrorism. They have been denounced by the international community through hundreds of resolutions adopted by this international Organization. They are undeniably crimes of war.

Regrettably, however, acts of terrorism are subject to varying standards. In that respect, we reiterate that the most serious threat faced in the global war on terrorism in which we are engaged is posed by Israel's changeable, unilateral interpretations of the counter-terrorism struggle and of the resolutions of international legitimacy. Indeed, according to Israeli logic and views — which, unfortunately, enjoy the sponsorship and support of some States — Israel's practice of organized and systematic State terrorism against the Palestinian people, and its pursuit of policies based on murder, destruction, the infliction of hunger, tyranny, injustice, the imposition of collective punishment and the violation of human rights and international humanitarian law, are all justified by claims of self-defence against air, electricity, water and food — in other words, against humankind — under the pretext of combating so-called Palestinian terrorism. What kind of legitimate self-defence can authorize acts that flout international resolutions and the provisions of international law?

Syria joined the consensus on the adoption of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy on the basis of its support for all international efforts in that field. Syria knows that the Strategy provides important support for international cooperation on counter-terrorism. However, as it did in the debates preceding the Strategy's adoption, Syria reaffirms the need to adopt a coherent and comprehensive national, regional and international approach to counter terrorism and deplete its sources. To that end, Syria calls for a comprehensive analysis of all aspects of terrorism and of the circumstances that promote the spread of that scourge in order to build a common international understanding of the best way to address it and combat it.

Syria reiterates that terrorism poses an ongoing threat to international peace and security. It also reaffirms its respect for the relevant international counter-terrorism resolutions. Syria is convinced in that respect that the United Nations plays a pivotal role in building international consensus in the struggle

against terrorism. Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001), 1267 (1999), 1526 (2004), 1540 (2004) and 1566 (2004) have created a cohesive legal framework for fighting terrorism at the international level.

On that basis, Syria is cooperating fully with the United Nations and with the Security Council's sanctions Committees through the consideration by the relevant Syrian parties of the observations set down by the Counter-Terrorism Committee in its Preliminary Implementation Assessment. Syria is now amending legislative decree No. 33 of 2005, as noted in its fifth report to the Committee.

The Syrian Arab Republic is sparing no effort in the struggle against money-laundering and the financing of terrorism. To that end, Syria has acceded to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and has joined the Edgemont Group, whose membership includes financial investigation units from 106 States and which is designed to receive and address notifications of financial transactions suspected of being operations to launder money or finance terrorism. Syria's efforts have been acknowledged internationally in the joint report, which underscored Syria's success in recent years in adopting measures and enacting important legislation to that end, in accordance with relevant international recommendations. The report has thus greatly contributed to strengthening the confidence of a number of international financial institutions interested in the subject.

Syria supports the efforts of the Security Council Committee mandated to monitor the implementation of resolution 1540 (2004), which Syria considers a positive step towards ensuring the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and guaranteeing international peace and security. Syria does not possess such weapons and it has no intention of possessing them. Moreover, it has declared this in numerous public statements in the United Nations, including before the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and the First Committee of the General Assembly.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, to whom I now give the floor.

Ms. Rodríguez de Ortiz (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation congratulates you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of

May, and thanks the Chairmen of the Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004) for their briefings today.

The Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela reiterates its firm and categorical condemnation of terrorism and reaffirms its commitment to combat terrorism in all of its forms and manifestations with full respect for international law, international standards on the protection of human rights and international humanitarian law. The essential expression of this commitment has been the strengthening of our legislation aimed at combating terrorist acts, and the adoption of measures to intensify our regional and global cooperation in fighting this scourge, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

In this context, our delegation would like once again to recall before the Security Council the request for extradition, which almost three years ago the Venezuelan Government submitted to the Government of the United States with regard to the notorious criminal and international terrorist Luis Posada Carriles, a fugitive from Venezuelan justice who is responsible for carrying out many terrorist plots, the most well known of which was the attack on the Cubana de Aviación aeroplane, which caused the death of 73 innocent civilians in 1976 in Barbados. That request has been ignored by the United States even though Venezuela has complied with all of the relevant requirements. In this context, the United States authorities have accused Posada Carriles only of minor immigration crimes.

The delegation of the United States has repeatedly argued that, since 27 September 2005, when the immigration judge ordered the expulsion of Posada Carriles, the competent authorities have been considering how to carry out that order. As has been stated in this Chamber by the United States delegation, the immigration judge ordered that this person could not be deported either to Cuba or to Venezuela, because it was probable that, if he were transferred to those countries, he would be tortured.

Such arguments are unacceptable and are simply technical legal manoeuvres designed to bypass our request for extradition while this terrorist continues to walk freely on United States territory. Since 1961, Venezuela has been a State party to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading

Treatment or Punishment and has always respected our commitments under international law. We request the extradition of Posada Carriles so that he can be tried for terrorist acts, with the due process guaranteed by our national legislation.

To conclude, it is necessary for all States to cooperate in accordance with international law in order to find, deny haven to, capture and bring to justice, on the basis of trial or extradition under national legislation, anyone who finances, plans, supports, prepares or commits terrorist acts or provides safe haven, or who participates or intends to participate in any such activity.

Once again, we bring our request to the Counter-Terrorism Committee to review and verify compliance by the United States with its obligations in fighting terrorism, specifically in the case of Luis Posada Carriles, in accordance with resolution 1373 (2001), the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, the bilateral extradition treaty signed in 1922, the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation.

Double standards should not prevail in the fight against terrorism.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Qatar, to whom I now give the floor.

Mr. Al-Nasser (Qatar) (spoke in Arabic): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate on an item that concerns one of the most important challenges to international peace and security. I should also like to extend our thanks to the Chairmen of the three Security Council Committees for their briefings. We are pleased to make the following observations, which we had previously expressed during our two years as a member of the Security Council, but whose importance we would like to underline in the light of the briefings we heard this morning.

In general terms, we note that the Security Council deals with terrorism without a clear definition of the word, and without addressing its root causes and the reasons behind its spread. Nor does the Council take into proper account the issues of human rights and international law, including international humanitarian law. Thus, the Council is neglecting one of the most

important elements of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, which two years ago was adopted by the General Assembly as its resolution 60/288.

Secondly, the Security Council adopts means to deal with terrorism without sufficient coherence or coordination with other United Nations organs, such as the General Assembly and its Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and other committees and counter-terrorism mechanisms in the United Nations system, including the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. It is thus important to assess and review the Council's policy regarding terrorism.

I turn now to the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001). Despite the fact that the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) was renewed in resolution 1805 (2008), no end date for the work of the Committee itself has been set. One of the most encouraging things is that by mid-2009 the role of the Committee will be reviewed by the Council; we hope that this will be a comprehensive review, taking into account the lessons learned. It was important that the resolution included some positive elements, such as underlining the importance of States, in their counter-terrorism activities, complying with their obligations under international humanitarian law, international law, human rights law and refugee law. The resolution referred to CTITF and the importance of the participation of the CTED in activities undertaken in the framework of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

The organizational plan for CTED contained in document S/2008/80, which was submitted by the Executive Directorate in accordance with the provisions of resolution 1787 (2007), sets forth a number of important points, such as the establishment of a centre for quality control to review all documents before they are issued and a proposed amendment of the working methods of CTED so that it may better focus and adapt its visits to countries in all areas. But we hoped to see in this resolution and in the organizational plan a fuller explanation of those positive aspects and a clearer timetable for the resolution's implementation.

It is very important that the Council should deal non-selectively with all aspects of terrorism, but in particular efforts at preparing Preliminary

Implementation Assessments should be fair and the visits undertaken by CTED should be balanced and comprehensive, since resolution 1373 (2001) requires all States without exception to pass counter-terrorism legislation. Accordingly, we should not focus only on visits to certain regions or countries, while exempting other States because they are developed or because they export technical assistance to other countries.

Experience and recent events have proven that there is a deficiency in the laws of some developed countries that do not fit the requirements of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) concerning the prohibition of incitement. Such acts of incitement to hatred have been occurring repeatedly, particularly with regard to sacred matters, and have thus provoked great emotion. Those acts violate resolution 1624 (2005) and create an environment not conducive to counter-terrorism efforts, thereby undermining efforts undertaken in the context of the Alliance of Civilizations. Such acts prevent dealing with the underlying causes of terrorism that are outlined in the Global Strategy.

With regard to the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities, the listing and de-listing of names and groups on the consolidated list does not take into account due process. It is quite politicized, which strips the Council of important credibility in the counter-terrorism arena. The nature of the work of the Committee's Monitoring Team also needs to be reviewed. The reports presented by the Team include at times undocumented judgments that could be interpreted as an implied accusation of terrorism against specific countries and specific regions.

With regard to the Security Council Committee on weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004), we should not introduce controversial issues in the work of that Committee. The committee should concentrate on prohibiting the acquisition of WMDs by non-State actors. The best means of doing that is basically the disarmament of those weapons and the prohibition of their proliferation by implementing international treaties in that regard. We should not take resolutions prohibiting the proliferation of WMDs as a pretext for preventing States from enjoying technology and rights for peaceful purposes, in accordance with international treaties in that area.

On the basis of our position supporting efforts to combat terrorism, whether nationally or through multilateral agreements, we emphasize the importance of full compliance with international law and international humanitarian law, as well as all related conventions and protocols, so that such efforts to counter terrorism would not be vindictive, leading to an increase in terrorist acts, rather than addressing the causes of terrorism.

Also, we should not equate terrorism with the legitimate struggle against foreign occupation. Since the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, is responsible for maintaining international peace and security, it is therefore very important to enhance the credibility of this organ and to build the deepest trust between it and the States Members of the United Nations, so that its policies concerning counter-terrorism in all its forms and manifestations can be activated and implemented in full.

The President: The representative of the United States has asked for the floor to make a further statement.

Mr. DeLaurentis (United States of America): The Council is here today to review the work of the 1267 Committee, the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the 1540 Committee. Most speakers have engaged constructively in discussing ways to increase cooperation and advance the work of the three committees, and we appreciate those contributions. It is disappointing, therefore, that two representatives in particular departed from the focus of the debate to introduce allegations that distort the facts of two cases being adjudicated in the United States.

In the case of Mr. Luis Posada Carriles, the United States has taken a number of legal actions with respect to Mr. Posada. In taking these steps, the United States has acted in ways that are consistent with international law and with our domestic legal framework, which provides various constitutional safeguards to protect individual rights. As with all democracies that follow the rule of law — as opposed to other systems of governance — those safeguards provide that an individual cannot be brought to trial or extradited unless sufficient evidence has been established that he committed the offense for which he has been charged. In the United States, this standard is described as “probable cause”. Let me present a brief

overview of steps my Government has taken with respect to Posada within this legal framework.

Posada entered the United States illegally in early 2005. He was detained by immigration authorities in the United States on 17 May 2005, and he was, in accordance with United States law, placed in removal proceedings. On 27 September 2005, an immigration judge ordered Posada’s removal from the United States but granted a deferral of removal to Cuba and Venezuela under the regulations implementing the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

The court ordered that Posada “be deported and removed from the United States to any country other than Cuba and Venezuela willing to accept him”. This order remains in effect. The United States has been seeking ways to implement it, consistent with the terms of the order and United States regulations that implement the obligations of the United States under the Convention against Torture.

Moreover, the United States sought and obtained a criminal indictment charging Posada with violations of our immigration laws. The United States District Court handling that case dismissed the indictment. As is well known, our judges are wholly independent of the executive branch of our Government. They enjoy tenure for life and are fiercely independent. This federal judge, not sitting in Florida but in Texas, reached her decision according to her reading of the law.

In our system, as in all those that respect the rule of law, a decision by the courts must be obeyed unless and until it is overturned by a higher court. The United States filed a notice appealing the district court’s decision dismissing the case on 5 June 2007, but that appeal has not yet been decided.

Posada also remains under investigation for past activities. In the meantime, Posada remains subject to the order of removal issued by the immigration judge and is without legal status in the United States. He is also subject to an order of supervision from the Department of Homeland Security Immigration and Customs Enforcement, which imposes certain restrictions on Posada, including reporting and monitoring requirements. In sum, the United States continues to be engaged in an ongoing series of actions

with respect to Posada, consistent with our legal requirements, due process and the rule of law.

In the case of the five Cubans accused of spying, in 2001 the individuals in question were convicted in United States federal courts of conspiracy to commit espionage, among other charges, which included conspiracy by one of those individuals to commit murder, having supported and implemented a plan to shoot down United States civilian aircraft. On 31 October 2005, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals vacated a previous ruling by a three-judge appellate panel that ordered a new trial. On rehearing, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals as a whole affirmed the propriety of the trial on the challenged ground and returned the rest of the appellate issues to the three-judge panel for a decision. The remaining appellate issues await a decision by the court.

The five convicted spies are serving their prison sentences while the case is processed in the United States judicial system. The United States has always provided the five defendants with all the guarantees of due process inherent in the independent and impartial United States judicial system. Despite the frustration expressed by the two speakers who raised these cases, we assure them that United States courts and administrative procedures are independent and that they fairly and impartially interpret and apply the law.

The President: The representative of Cuba has requested the floor to make a further statement. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Quiñones Sánchez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of my delegation, I wish to thank you, Madam President, for the opportunity to address this body once again to respond to the comments made by the representative of the United States. I do not believe that the claims presented by Cuba distort the objective of this debate. It is in our interest to contribute constructively to Security Council debate on terrorism so as to promote cooperation and the true fight against that scourge.

We are dealing with a case of the clear violation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001). Time and again, we hear the same baseless arguments. Once again, Council members and the other delegations present in this Chamber await specific responses regarding actions by the Government of the United

States to deal with a clear and infamous case of international terrorism.

The reality is far different from what they would have us believe. Thursday, 8 May, will be the first anniversary of the permanent release of the terrorist Posada Carriles. To date, despite all the evidence at its disposal, the Government of the United States has not charged Posada Carriles with his terrorist activities. We are witnesses to ridiculous and shameful efforts by the prosecution to continue to delay this case, which are a legal delaying tactic to prevent justice from being done. At the same time, the terrorist's legal defence is being given countless deadlines in order to continue an endless immigration trial, which we know does not ultimately guarantee the imposition of any kind of punishment for his terrorist acts. Once again, we reaffirm in this Chamber the falseness of the claim that the United States authorities have acted in accordance with international law.

The double standards, the hypocrisy and the lies seem to be limitless. Among the arguments used against the extradition of Posada Carriles to Venezuela, they say that he runs the risk of being tortured. The accusing Government is trying to evade the criminal past of Posada Carriles, who, at the command of the Central Intelligence Agency, tortured young Latin Americans. Obviously, it is protecting him. The accuser seems to forget that it has been exactly four years since the atrocities committed by the United States occupation forces at Abu Ghraib came to light. It wishes to forget the approval of torture at the illegally occupied Guantánamo naval base, the secret kidnappings of people throughout the world, the secret flights and the clandestine prisons, all on the pretext of fighting terrorism.

The United States ought to be silent — at least for the sake of decency — concern itself with resolving its problems and become a true fighter against terrorism by complying with the international legal order.

Fortunately, the Cuba in which acts of torture were committed ceased to exist long ago. It was the Cuba of drunken Marines in the streets of Havana desecrating our national monuments — the Cuba of the dictator Fulgencio Batista, murdering or torturing students with the tacit complicity of the United States leaders of that era. On 1 January 1959, Cuba freed itself from the terrorist assassins and torturers of the

Batista dictatorship, who left our country to go to their true safe haven, the United States of America.

Despite the rigged trial that took place in Miami against our five heroes, the struggle of our compatriots against anti-Cuban terrorism has been amply demonstrated in the United States. They were convicted solely for having risked their lives to fight terrorist groups that operate freely in that city. The whole illegal trial against our five heroes has amounted to scandalous support for the anti-Cuban terrorist groups operating there. It is truly embarrassing that, while our five heroes are unjustly imprisoned and subjected to draconian sentences and punishments and while their human rights are brutally violated, the terrorist hijackers of Cuban ships and aircraft receive easy terms of bail, and some of them are even set free in the United States. This demonstrates once again that the United States Government does not punish the crime of terrorism when it is perpetrated against countries that do not bow before its imperialist policy. The five heroes must be released. They cannot be compared to Posada Carriles, who has committed acts of a different kind: terrorist acts.

The struggle against terrorism requires seriousness, commitment and, above all, political will. Cuba reiterates its urgent request that the Security Council, using the means at its disposal, duly consider our claims and act accordingly.

The President: The representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has also requested the floor to make a further statement. I invite her to take a seat at the Council table and to make her statement.

Ms. Rodríguez de Ortiz (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): We would like to thank you, Madam President, for this second opportunity to take the floor, and we apologize to those present for once again taking the floor. However, for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, this Council is an important forum in which to address these issues,

which are indeed a priority for our country. We do not share the opinion of the Mission of the United States that this is not the appropriate forum. Yes, this is the appropriate forum.

What the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is again requesting in this Council is compliance with commitments undertaken by States under international treaties. We do not understand why the United States cannot comply with the extradition treaty that has been signed by our two countries. They are simply disregarding an extradition request that we have put forward, which complies with all the requirements that the treaty establishes. Why do they ignore our request for extradition, and try the terrorist Posada Carriles only for immigration violations? We reject the argument that Posada Carriles cannot be extradited to our country because he could be tortured there. We reiterate that Venezuela complies with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Our country always guarantees due process. The torturers are others.

The Government of the United States has all the necessary documentation to prove the terrorist nature of the activities of Posada Carriles. Their concern in this case therefore makes a mockery of justice, the memory of the victims of terrorist acts and the suffering of their families. It is also an example of the double standards of a Government that says it fights against terrorism, but in its actions supports terrorist methods.

The Security Council must examine the case, and the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) must verify compliance by the Government of the United States with its commitments in fighting terrorism in accordance with international law.

The President: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 1.25 p.m.



Security Council

Sixty-third year

5887th meeting

 Wednesday, 7 May 2008, 10 a.m.
 New York

Provisional

President:	Ms. Pierce	(United Kingdom)
Members:	Belgium	Mr. Verbeke
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Jurica
	France	Mr. Ripert
	Indonesia	Mr. Natalegawa
	Italy	Mr. Spatafora
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Ettalhi
	Panama	Mr. Suescum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	South Africa	Mr. Kumalo
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff
	Viet Nam	Mr. Le Luong Minh

Agenda

The situation in Sierra Leone

Sixth report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Integrated Office
 in Sierra Leone (S/2008/281)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.



The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Sierra Leone

Sixth report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (S/2008/281)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Sierra Leone, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Pemagbi (Sierra Leone) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Dmitry Titov, Assistant Secretary-General for Rule of Law and Security Institutions in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Titov to take a seat at the Council table.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Frank Majoor, Chairman of the Sierra Leone Configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of the Netherlands.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Majoor to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations. Members of the Council have before them document S/2008/281, which contains the sixth report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear briefings by Mr. Dmitry Titov and His Excellency Mr. Frank Majoor. I now give the floor to Mr. Dmitry Titov.

Mr. Titov: I would like to thank you, Madam President, for the opportunity to present the sixth report (S/2008/281) of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (UNIOSIL). The report provides an update on major developments in that country and highlights the key challenges facing it. It also contains the Secretary-General's recommendations on the mandate, structure and strength of the integrated office that is being proposed to succeed UNIOSIL. My remarks in introducing the report will be relatively brief. I will focus on the preparations for the local elections, the challenges being faced by the security sector, the socio-economic conditions in the country, human rights and rule of law issues, peacebuilding support activities and the proposed mandate, structure and strength of the post-UNIOSIL office.

Since its inauguration into office in September last year, the new Government of Sierra Leone has taken several major steps to implement its reform agenda, as well as policies that promote transparency and accountability. As mentioned in the report, President Koroma has outlined his vision for change for the country, Cabinet ministers have signed contracts agreeing to implement the priorities outlined by the President, Parliament has continued to function and the judiciary organs are fully operational.

The political and security situation in the country remains generally calm, although incidents — sometimes violent, as took place recently — are emanating from political intolerance between supporters of the main opposition political party, the Sierra Leone People's Party (SLPP), and the ruling political party, the All People's Congress (APC).

On 5 July, Sierra Leone will take another major step towards enhancing its democratic process, with the holding of local council elections. The United

Nations Development Programme (UNDP), in close cooperation with UNIOSIL, has deployed a United Nations electoral assistance team, which is providing technical support to the National Electoral Commission. Through a UNDP-managed basket fund, international partners have pledged and already contributed a considerable amount, totalling \$24.6 million, required for the elections. The candidate nomination process for the elections ended on 20 April. Some 1,300 candidates have submitted nomination papers for 456 councillor positions in 394 electoral wards, while 65 candidates have submitted nomination papers for 19 Council chairperson or mayor positions in the country.

As members of the Council have seen from the report, the United Nations is providing technical assistance to the National Electoral Commission and is also assisting with the procurement of voter registration and election materials. As a result of the very tight timelines for the elections, the Electoral Commission, in consultation with the political parties, has agreed to shorten the voter registration period. In addition, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is making efforts to expedite the procurement of election materials.

However, there is concern that political tensions between supporters of the SLPP and the APC will continue in the period leading up to the local council elections. Therefore, UNIOSIL is working closely and actively with all key stakeholders, including the Government, opposition parties, the National Electoral Commission, the Political Parties Registration Commission and civil society to ensure peaceful and violence-free elections. In addition, with the assistance of UNIOSIL, a security plan, funded through the UNDP Basket Fund, is being prepared by the Sierra Leone Police. The United Nations Mission is also helping to strengthen the Political Parties District Code of Conduct Monitoring Committees, which usually plays a vital mediation role in the electoral process.

We are glad to report that considerable progress has been made in enhancing the professionalism and effectiveness of the Republic of Sierra Leone Armed Forces and the Sierra Leone Police. UNIOSIL has been helpful in training and mentoring the police and in building the capacity of the Office of National Security, which coordinates all Sierra Leonean security sector agencies, while the United Kingdom-led International Military Advisory Training Team has

been assisting with the training of the Republic of Sierra Leone Armed Forces. In an effort to streamline the armed forces, the Government recently approved a reduction in its strength from a personnel of 10,500 to 8,500 persons, which is expected to take place over the period of the next two years. Despite these achievements, both the army and the police continue to be plagued by serious logistical deficiencies, in particular shortages of accommodation, equipment and fuel supplies, especially for the conduct of patrols. Moreover, the national security agencies still require assistance in building capacity to combat drug trafficking and to improve airport security.

On the subject of socio-economic developments in the country, regrettably, there has been little improvement on this front. The soaring prices of staple commodities and fuel have exacerbated the overall security conditions in the country. Although the Government is sensitizing the population about the external factors leading to the rise in the cost of the country's main staple — rice — there is a real risk that discontent over price increases could trigger unrest. The Government has created a task force to deal with the food crisis and has promised to work towards achieving self-sufficiency in rice production, which will obviously require time and considerable investment to achieve. Currently, the country is producing only 30 per cent of the rice it consumes.

The peace consolidation process in Sierra Leone has the potential to be compromised if the country does not generate adequate employment opportunities for the multitude of young people. It is hoped that the Bumbuna Hydroelectric Project, which is expected to increase power supplies across the country, will create considerable employment opportunities and increase private investment in the country. In the short- to medium-term, the country will continue to need generous and sustainable support from the international community to create jobs.

As regards human rights and the rule of law, I would like to inform the Council that there has been an overall improvement in the human rights situation in the country, as evidenced by the increased respect for civil and political rights, the adoption of legislation on the rights of women and children and the work of the Human Rights Commission. However, efforts to implement the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission are still very slow. The Justice Sector Development Programme funded by the

United Kingdom's Department for International Development is playing a critical role in building the capacity of the justice sector. However, the Government will continue to require long-term external support in order to establish credible and sustainable rule of law institutions.

On the Peacebuilding Commission, the adoption by the Commission of a Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework for Sierra Leone has injected fresh impetus into the peace consolidation process. UNIOSIL is working closely with Ambassador Majoor, the Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific chair for Sierra Leone, to support the overall work of the Commission. The United Nations mission is advising the Government on the implementation of its commitments contained in the Framework, supporting the Government's preparations for meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission and bringing key stakeholders together to promote peacebuilding activities.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about the mandate and structure of the new proposed mission. As members have seen from the report before the Council, the document sets out the Secretary-General's recommendations on the mandate, structure and strength of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office, as had been requested by the Council. These recommendations were developed through a consultative process that involved various players, including the Department of Political Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme, the Peacebuilding Support Office, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, obviously, the Department of Field Support and the country team. These recommendations were also the result of extensive consultations with senior Government officials in Sierra Leone, political parties, civil society and development partners. Every effort has been made to ensure that the new entity, the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office (UNIPSIL), optimizes United Nations system-wide cooperation and synergies in the fulfilment of its mandate.

As outlined in the report, UNIPSIL will assist the Government in several tasks: identifying and resolving political tensions, completing good governance reforms, politically and economically empowering youth and women, implementing the Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework, supporting the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding

Fund, strengthening the justice sector and supporting security sector reform.

The report proposes that the new office be headed by an Executive Representative of the Secretary-General, who will report directly to the Department of Political Affairs, as well as to the UNDP Administrator, in his or her capacity as United Nations Resident Coordinator and as UNDP Resident Representative. As the Council is aware, since the departure in December of the former Executive Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Victor Angelo, this position has been vacant. The Secretary-General is in the process of identifying a suitable replacement. We expect that the post will be filled shortly.

In conclusion, there are hopeful prospects for Sierra Leone to move forward and improve its socio-economic situation. However, such progress will require the Government to make tough economic and political decisions and implement policies that promote transparency and accountability. It will also require sacrifice and patience on the part of the Sierra Leonean population as the country continues its journey towards full economic and social recovery. I would like to underline that there is a real opportunity to consolidate the gains already made in the country if the international community sustains its support for the peacebuilding process.

Finally, allow me to convey our profound gratitude to the Security Council, the troop- and police-contributing countries, the Economic Community of West African States, the African Union, our bilateral and multilateral partners and non-governmental organizations for their consistent support to UNIOSIL, which has enabled the Mission to accomplish so much within its mandated tasks. Obviously, we are also grateful to the strong country-specific support of the Peacebuilding Commission, under the impressive leadership of Ambassador Majoor.

Mr. Majoor: Thank you very much, Madam President, for inviting me to participate in the consultations in my capacity as the chair of the Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific meetings on Sierra Leone. My last statement in this capacity before the Security Council dates back to 14 December 2007 (*see S/PV.5804*). On that occasion I briefed the Council on the adoption of the Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework by the Government of Sierra Leone and the Peacebuilding Commission. Today I

would like to brief the Council on a number of key developments since then, in particular the advocacy and resource-mobilization efforts of the Peacebuilding Commission and the findings of my recent visit to Sierra Leone.

With the successful adoption of the Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework, the engagement of the Commission with Sierra Leone has focused on three primary objectives: generating support for the implementation of the commitments contained in the Framework, broadening of the donor base in Sierra Leone, and triggering new activities or up-scaling existing activities in peacebuilding priority areas. To that end, the Commission agreed on a work plan outlining a focused resource-mobilization, outreach and advocacy strategy. The Framework was transmitted to all relevant stakeholders through a joint letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sierra Leone and the Minister for Development Cooperation of the Netherlands.

As the chair of the Sierra Leone country-specific meetings, I undertook ambassadorial-level bilateral meetings and visited key capitals — Washington, London, Brussels, Berlin and The Hague — to raise awareness about the Framework and to garner political and financial support for its implementation. The Government of Sierra Leone did the same and approached various bilateral, regional and multilateral stakeholders for support for the implementation of the Framework. Those advocacy and resource-mobilization efforts will culminate in a high-level stakeholders consultation on the implementation of the Framework in New York on 19 May, in which, I hope, the members of the Security Council will participate actively.

In preparation for that meeting and in order to obtain first-hand information on the status of Framework implementation, I visited Sierra Leone from 21 to 25 April. The programme for the visit included meetings with the President, the Vice-President, other senior representatives of the Government and the majority and minority leaders in parliament, as well as with representatives of the international community and civil society and the private sector. The visit reinforced the commitment of the stakeholders on the ground to the implementation of the Framework and identified some concrete challenges requiring immediate attention from the Government of Sierra Leone and the international community.

Over the last three months, the Government of Sierra Leone, with the support of the United Nations and other partners, has made significant progress in implementing several commitments contained in the Peacebuilding Framework. Impressive developments have taken place in the areas of justice and security sector reform, anti-corruption and energy sector development and in the preparation for local council elections. However, there are also a number of challenges that must be addressed in the next few months. I would like to highlight five challenges here today.

First, the overall economic situation in Sierra Leone remains fragile, especially in light of the rising prices of rice and fuel. President Koroma has stressed that from June 2008 agricultural development and food security will become a new top priority of the Government. The United Nations and other international partners would need to support the Government in ensuring that food security issues do not destabilize the country, especially in the lead-up to the local council elections. The Government has set up a task force on food security.

On the issue of economic recovery, I would also like to note that much of the international assistance to the country continues to be provided through projects, in the absence of sector-wide strategies, programmes and funding mechanisms. The Peacebuilding Commission's high-level stakeholders consultation on Sierra Leone on 19 May will explore specific opportunities for sector-wide support through multi-donor funding mechanisms. In that context I would underline the importance of continued budget support by those donors in a position to provide that to the Government of Sierra Leone.

Secondly, the preparations for the local council elections scheduled for 5 July have been marked by some inter-party and intra-party political tensions. Sierra Leone remains divided along ethnic and geographic lines, requiring intensified efforts for national reconciliation and unity. Isolated episodes have also been recorded, especially in the southern and eastern parts of the country. Those developments underline the importance of continued political engagement by the Peacebuilding Commission with the country. Also — and Mr. Titov referred to this as well — the timely procurement by the United Nations of supplies necessary for holding the local elections needs urgent attention and action.

Thirdly, in the area of youth employment — which is a critical peacebuilding priority area — differences persist on how to best address this challenge. Currently, there is no coherent overall policy framework on youth employment and empowerment, nor is there yet a clear focal point in the Government of Sierra Leone addressing the issue, and the international actors are divided in their approaches. The Government has the intention to establish a national youth commission to address the employment and empowerment of young people. The United Nations system, in particular the United Nations Development Programme, is also — and necessarily — in the process of reviewing its capacity and available technical expertise in this area. The 19 May high-level consultation represents a good opportunity to further explore various proposals and to arrive at a common approach.

Fourthly, although Security Council resolution 1793 (2007) mandated the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (UNIOSIL) to actively support the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and the implementation of the Framework, that has sometimes been difficult, due to lack of capacity and a temporary absence of leadership at the highest level. The post of the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General for UNIOSIL has not been filled since December of 2007. According to many stakeholders, that has limited the ability of the United Nations to take its leadership role and to be the main interlocutor with the Government of Sierra Leone at this critical juncture. The absence of an Executive Representative has limited the capacity of the United Nations to convene international partners in support of the Framework and, more generally, its coordinating role on the ground.

The fifth challenge is the need for an informal coordination forum on issues related to the Peacebuilding Commission, which a number of stakeholders in Sierra Leone have recognized. This should build on the existing coordination mechanisms such as the Development Partnership Committee and the Peacebuilding Fund steering committee. Both the Government of Sierra Leone and the international donors on the ground are determined to improve and strengthen coordination mechanisms in Freetown,

including on Peacebuilding Commission and Peacebuilding Fund matters, also in informal settings.

The challenges outlined above require our collective and timely action. I am confident that, given the commitment and the leadership of the Government of Sierra Leone and the continued support of the international community, we will be able to address them. In addition, the 19 May high-level stakeholders consultation and the 19 June biannual review of the Framework will offer opportunities for individual and collective action in response to some of these challenges.

In that regard, I would welcome continued support from the Security Council in ensuring the constructive engagement of all stakeholders in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, in particular their active participation in the high-level consultation. I would also like to request that, in considering the mandate and the structure of the follow-on integrated peacebuilding mission in Sierra Leone, the Security Council ensure that the office has the dedicated staff capacity to actively support the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and the implementation of the Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework. The follow-on mission must also have adequate operational capacity and logistical support to effectively carry out its mandate.

Finally, the apparently imminent nomination of a new Executive Representative of the Secretary-General will ensure the necessary steering in the transition process from UNIOSIL to the follow-on mission and will provide the high-level political support needed in the lead-up to the local council elections and in our collective peacebuilding efforts in support of the Government of Sierra Leone.

The President: I thank Mr. Majoor for his briefing.

There are no further speakers on my list. In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I should now like to invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion of the subject.

The meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.



Security Council

Sixty-third year

5888th meeting

Thursday, 8 May 2008, 10.30 a.m.
New York

Provisional

President:	Sir John Sawers	(United Kingdom)
Members:	Belgium	Mr. Verbeke
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Koudougou
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Weisleder
	Croatia	Mr. Jurica
	France	Mr. Ripert
	Indonesia	Mr. Natalegawa
	Italy	Mr. Spatafora
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Ettalhi
	Panama	Mr. Arias
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	South Africa	Mr. Kumalo
	United States of America	Mr. Khalilzad
	Viet Nam	Mr. Bui The Giang

Agenda

The situation in the Middle East

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.



The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salam (Lebanon) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Terje Roed-Larsen, Special Envoy for the implementation of Security Council resolution 1559 (2004).

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Roed-Larsen to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by Mr. Terje Roed-Larsen, to whom I give the floor.

Mr. Roed-Larsen: The Secretary-General submitted to the Security Council on 21 April his seventh semi-annual report on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1559 (2004). In my intervention today, I will focus on the main elements of the report and provide the Council with updates on events since 21 April.

Over the reporting period, Lebanon has continued to experience a severe political crisis, centred particularly on the failure to elect a president of the Republic. The position has remained vacant since 24 November 2007. Despite the sustained efforts of Lebanese, regional and international players, all attempts to elect a new president have not yet yielded results. The electoral void has fueled political polarization and impeded the normal functioning of the legitimate constitutional institutions of the country, in particular the Government and the Parliament. It has also contributed to violent and dangerous confrontations between the opposing parties, leading to casualties.

Since the release of the report, several new incidents have taken place. On 20 April, two followers of the Phalange party were killed and two wounded in the city of Zahle. On 5 May, five people were wounded by gunfire in separate overnight clashes between supporters of the majority and the opposition in Beirut and elsewhere in the country.

Early on 7 May, Hizbollah-led demonstrators blocked the principal highway and other roads leading to Beirut's international airport, port and commercial centre with burning tires and large mounds of earth. Soon afterwards, scuffles broke out between pro-Government and opposition supporters in the Beirut neighbourhood of Corniche al-Mazraa. During that incident, a hand grenade was thrown into the crowd, injuring five people, including two Lebanese army officers. The General Labour Confederation abandoned its call for a general strike originally scheduled for that day. An escalation then ensued, involving the targeting of some political party offices by gunfire and heavy exchanges of fire between pro-Government and opposition groups in several areas of Beirut and its environs. A rocket-propelled grenade hit an office of the Future Party in Beirut.

On the evening of 7 May, Future Party supporters blocked the main road between the towns of Baalbeck and Chtura in the Bekaa valley and the Masnaa road leading to the Lebanese border with Syria. A number of armed clashes also took place in the Bekaa valley. In Beirut, heavy exchanges of fire were reported around the national stadium adjacent to the airport road.

Today, a very tense calm has returned to the capital. However, several roads remain closed. Demonstrations have spread throughout towns and

along main roads in the Bekaa valley. Roads are being blocked and tires burned. The mass of today's armed exchanges have centred on various locations in the Bekaa valley. Future Party supporters have also blocked sections of the main highway that runs North-South along Lebanon's coast. Access to Beirut international airport remains restricted due to the ongoing roadblocks by Hizbollah. The opposition has stated that those measures will remain in place until the cabinet decision of 6 May is reversed.

So far this morning, we have received reports of two fatalities and 10 injuries.

The United Nations has remained in close touch with both sides in an effort to reduce tensions. We remain gravely concerned about the potential for a further escalation of the situation. Several capitals in the region and beyond have made public calls for an end to the clashes. The Secretary-General urges all parties to cease immediately the riots and to reopen all roads in the country. The tense political climate has constituted a significant obstacle towards the implementation of resolution 1559 (2004).

In that context, the construed existence of Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias and allegations of widespread rearming and paramilitary training across the political spectrum constitutes a major challenge for the Government of Lebanon. It challenges its authority throughout Lebanon and is a threat to the country's stability.

Hizbollah, the most significant Lebanese militia, maintains a massive paramilitary infrastructure separate from the State. That has an adverse effect on the efforts of the Government of Lebanon to enjoy the monopoly on the use of force and to impose law and order in the country. It also constitutes a threat to regional peace and security. It is worrisome to note that militants of Hizbollah were carrying weapons in populated areas in the context of the recent clashes.

On 26 April, a French delegate to a Socialist International meeting in Beirut was stopped and questioned for more than five hours by Hizbollah in South Beirut as he was taking pictures on the road leading to Beirut airport. Hizbollah justified his detention, saying it was motivated by security concerns.

The Government of Lebanon has informed the United Nations that Hizbollah has developed

throughout the country a secure communications network separate from the State's system. According to the Government, that network covers the whole area south of the Litani and the entire Mediterranean coastline up to the border with Syria. It crosses entirely Mount Lebanon from South to North. The network also covers a series of Palestinian camps south of Beirut and in the Bekaa valley. It connects to a Syrian network beyond the border. The Government has deemed the network illegal and said that "it constitutes an attack on the sovereignty of the State". For its part, Hizbollah has claimed that the network is part of its arsenal that should not be harmed.

The Government of Lebanon has disclosed that Hizbollah has established a system of surveillance cameras at Beirut airport. Against that backdrop, the Government of Lebanon decided to remove Brigadier General Wafiq Shoucair from his post as commander of the security of Beirut international airport.

On 7 May, supporters of Hizbollah launched violent protests in Beirut against the Government decisions. In the early afternoon of 8 May, the Higher Shiite Council stated that the solution to the crisis required the Government to change its decision of 6 May.

Those developments give rise to growing fears among the Lebanese that Hizbollah is building parallel institutional structures distinct from and in competition with those of the State. It is believed that this contributes to the erosion of the State's institutions and of its monopoly on the use of force. The United Nations also continues to be deeply concerned by the activities of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command and Fatah-Intifada, which maintain significant paramilitary infrastructures outside refugee camps and along the border between Lebanon and Syria. These two Palestinian militias are headquartered in Damascus. The Government of Syria bears responsibility for urging these groups to abide by Security Council resolutions and the decisions of the Government of Lebanon, as indicated publicly by Prime Minister Siniora.

Over the reporting period, there has been no discussion among Lebanese political leaders about a political process leading to the disbanding and disarming of Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias, as called for by the Taif Agreement of 1989 and resolution 1559 (2004).

The Secretary-General once again reiterates his firm conviction that the disarming of Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias must take place through a political process that will lead to the full affirmation of the authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout its territory. Such a political process presupposes clear respect for the constitution by all parties. It also presupposes dialogue and a spirit of cooperation and conciliation between various political forces in Lebanon. A return to political dialogue and a resolution of the ongoing political crisis in Lebanon — most notably the issue of the Lebanese presidency — is necessary.

In the meantime, the United Nations is mindful of the regional ramifications of this issue. For that reason, the Secretary-General calls on all those parties that maintain close ties with Hizbollah and have the ability to influence it, in particular Syria and Iran, to support its transformation into a solely political party. The Secretary-General urges it to abide by the decisions of the Security Council and of the Government of Lebanon. This is consistent with the requirements of the Taif Agreement.

The full disarmament of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias is in the best interest of regional peace and stability.

The Secretary-General is deeply concerned that a presidential election has still not taken place. A president must be elected in a free and fair electoral process conducted strictly according to Lebanese constitutional rules. It should take place without any foreign interference or influence, in accordance with the provisions of resolution 1559 (2004), without delay, as the continuing electoral void puts in jeopardy the delicate architecture that constitutes the Lebanese State. Such an election would also help revive the ordinary and constitutional political process in Lebanon, in particular the convening of parliament, which has been paralyzed since November 2006. The Secretary-General is disappointed that the repeated calls of the Lebanese people and the international community for an election have not been heeded.

At the same time, the Secretary-General remains mindful of the negative role played by external forces. These have intermingled with Lebanese internal dynamics. They have contributed to the political stalemate in the country. Such foreign interference is in violation of Security Council resolutions.

On 29 and 30 March 2008, the Arab League summit took place in Damascus in a tense atmosphere, as Lebanon remained in the grip of a political crisis and still had not elected a president. In its final communiqué, the Arab Leaders urged "Lebanon's leaders to accomplish the election of consensus candidate General Sleiman, on the set schedule and agree on the basis for the formation of a national unity government as soon as possible". The statement also emphasized "placing Lebanese-Syrian relations on the proper track in line with interests of both States, and assigning the Arab League Secretary General to start working on achieving this goal". The Secretary-General of the United Nations fully supports these decisions.

In the context of the prolonged electoral void, representatives of Egypt, France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Secretary General of the Council of the European Union, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Secretary-General of the Arab League and the acting Foreign Minister of Lebanon met in Kuwait on 22 April 2008. They expressed strong support to the legitimate Lebanese Government and deep dismay at the ongoing political stalemate. They called for the immediate election of the consensus candidate, General Sleiman, as president without prior conditions. They also called for the establishment of a national unity Government and the holding of general elections in conformity with an electoral law agreed by all parties, in accordance with the Arab League plan.

They further called on all parties inside and outside Lebanon to respect Lebanon's independence and sovereignty. They urged Syria and Lebanon to redefine and normalize their ties in mutual respect for their sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence as called for by resolution 1680 (2006).

They stated that the establishment of full diplomatic relations between Lebanon and Syria, the delineation of their shared border and a commitment not to permit the use of their respective territories to destabilize the other would constitute significant steps to secure peace and stability in the region.

Over the reporting period, the Secretary-General has continued his efforts to encourage the initiation of a process between Lebanon and Syria that would eventually lead to the establishment of full diplomatic

relations. This would be in fulfilment of the relevant provisions of resolution 1680 (2006). The Secretary-General has also promoted the timely implementation of tangible measures towards the delineation of the border between Syria and Lebanon.

Such progress would also be significantly helpful for the ongoing efforts of the Secretary-General in relation to his work on the issue of the Shaba'a farms area and Prime Minister's Siniora seven-point plan. Regrettably, there has been no progress to date on these matters. The Secretary-General commends the call by Prime Minister Siniora for the establishment of diplomatic relations between Syria and Lebanon and the delineation of their common borders. The Secretary-General expects the full cooperation of Syria to that end. It will be in the best interest of the stability of the region.

Over the reporting period, Lebanese territorial integrity has continued to be regularly violated by Israeli aircraft flying into Lebanese airspace. The Government of Israel has continued to claim that this is carried out for security reasons. The Secretary-General and his representatives have regularly continued to reiterate the concern of the United Nations and to call on Israel to cease these violations of Security Council resolutions. Furthermore, Israel continues to occupy the northern part of Ghajar, which constitutes a violation of Lebanon's sovereignty. The Secretary-General will report on these matters in more details to the Council in his next report on the implementation of resolution 1701 (2006).

The prolonged political and security crisis in Lebanon illustrates that the provisions of resolution 1559 (2004) remain as relevant now as they were when the resolution was adopted. I regret to inform the Council that over the last six months there has been no tangible progress towards the implementation of the resolution. To the contrary, the riots that started yesterday in Lebanon tragically illustrate that the country today confronts challenges of a magnitude unseen since the end of the civil war. The electoral void, the stalled functions of parliament and the defiant manoeuvres of militias are all threats to Lebanon's ability to operate as a sovereign, democratic and independent State. These developments can have serious regional repercussions.

As the election of a president has been postponed for the eighteenth time, to 13 May 2008, the

Secretary-General urges the parliament to convene on that date to fulfil its constitutional duties.

The Lebanese people now have a unique opportunity to open a new chapter in their difficult history. They and their political representatives must rise to the occasion and elect a president without any conditions beyond those prescribed by the constitution. Such an election would signify a major milestone on the road towards the full reassertion of Lebanon's sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and political independence. That is the goal of resolution 1559 (2004).

In that context, the Secretary-General commends and supports the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, Amre Moussa, to help the Lebanese bridge their differences and put an end to the electoral void. All concerned States and parties must cooperate urgently with the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States for the immediate implementation of the Arab Plan.

It is also imperative, three years after Syria's military withdrawal from Lebanon, to normalize relations between Syria and Lebanon. Prime Minister Fouad Siniora has extended an outstretched hand to Syria to address and resolve their bilateral differences. The Secretary-General calls on Syria to accept this offer, consistent with the commitment he received in Damascus from President Al-Assad in April 2007.

Finally, a return to political dialogue among the Lebanese parties through Lebanese constitutional institutions is imperative and is the only way to resolve all outstanding issues. This concerns first and foremost the election of a new president and the resumption of normal activities by parliament. Lebanon must preserve its comprehensive and, most importantly, conciliatory political framework, as set out in the Taif Agreement. In the meantime, the United Nations is mindful that Lebanon has remained a battleground for actors seeking to destabilize the region for their own benefit and to further their own aspirations of dominance. It is time for the Lebanese people and their political representatives alone to determine the fate of Lebanon.

Let me reassure the Council that the Secretary-General stands firmly beside the legitimate Lebanese Government and the people of Lebanon in their quest to recover their sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity. He remains

strongly committed to the full implementation of Security Council resolutions 1559 (2004) and 1680 (2006).

The President: I have no other speakers inscribed on my list. In accordance with the

understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I now invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion on the subject.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.



Security Council

Sixty-third year

Provisional

5889th meeting

 Monday, 12 May 2008, 3 p.m.
 New York

President:	Sir John Sawers	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
Members:	Belgium	Mr. Belle
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Tiendrébéogo
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. Lacroix
	Indonesia	Mr. Kleib
	Italy	Mr. Mantovani
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Panama	Mr. Arias
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	South Africa	Ms. van der Merwe
	United States of America	Mr. Khalilzad
	Viet Nam	Mr. Le Luong Minh

Agenda

Maintenance of international peace and security: role of the Security Council in supporting security sector reform

Report of the Secretary-General on securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform (S/2008/39)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.



The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Maintenance of international peace and security: role of the Security Council in supporting security sector reform

Report of the Secretary-General on securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform (S/2008/39)

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 37 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Ján Kubiš, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Slovakia.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

On behalf of the Council, I extend a very warm welcome to you, Mr. Minister. It is very good to have you here.

I also welcome the presence of Her Excellency Ms. Susan van der Merwe, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Yukio Takasu, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Japan.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2008/39, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform.

I very much welcome the presence of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, at this meeting. We understand that you are only

available, Sir, for a brief time because of other important business, which is also on the agenda of the Security Council. We are very privileged to have you here, and I invite you to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: It is an honour to join the Security Council for this discussion on the United Nations role in security sector reform. This issue is of special importance with respect to the responsibility of the United Nations, and of the Council in particular, for maintaining international peace and security.

I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Government of the United Kingdom for bringing us together for this important and timely debate. I also very much appreciate the tireless efforts of the Governments of Slovakia and South Africa in promoting this discussion.

This month we mark the sixtieth anniversary of United Nations peacekeeping. Maintaining international peace and security remains a daunting challenge for our Organization. Despite our efforts over these six decades, conflict and violence continue to pose a threat to nations and peoples. Unquestionably, Member States remain central providers of security for States and their populations. That is their sovereign right and responsibility, as is the work to reform their security sectors. It is, however, the responsibility of the United Nations to determine how we can best support Member States in delivering enduring security through effective institutions.

In February 2007, I addressed the Council for the first time on the issue of security sector reform (see S/PV.5632). The term is a relatively new one, but in practice the experience of the United Nations in this area goes back decades, spanning a range of activities and United Nations departments, offices, funds and programmes. As early as 1989, the United Nations was tasked with supporting a newly independent Namibia in developing preliminary structures for its armed forces. Since the early 1990s, our peace operations have assisted national authorities in establishing new policing institutions and in strengthening the capacity and integrity of defence structures.

In Angola and Mozambique our mandates included support for the integration, reform and training of armed forces, and partnerships with bilateral donors in the areas of coordination and delivery. From El Salvador and Cambodia in the past to Liberia and Sierra Leone today, the United Nations has

assisted parties in security reform in the context of good offices, mediation and peacekeeping operations. From Guatemala to Afghanistan and from Burundi to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, our experience in mediating and implementing peace agreements shows that if these agreements are to succeed and endure, the work to reform security institutions needs to be addressed from the outset.

In other words, the United Nations has rich and varied experience in what has come to be known as security sector reform. And yet, too often, we have remained an ad hoc partner for national and international stakeholders. What has been lacking is a common framework and a coherent system-wide approach. Despite our hands-on record, we have only limited institutional structures to guide engagement on the ground. We need to strengthen our ability to provide consistent, well-coordinated and high-quality technical advice during peace processes and in peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development. We need to make our approach less piecemeal and more holistic.

That is why, at the request of the Security Council and the General Assembly, I issued a report (S/2008/39) in February entitled "Securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform". As many here know, it was the product of broad consultations with Member States, regional groupings and organizations, as well as research centres, academic institutions and non-governmental organizations. It was also subject to wide-ranging consultations within the United Nations system, both at Headquarters and in the field.

The starting point for the report is a broad discussion of the concept, underscoring its linkages to many important processes. It makes clear that, in any context, security reform must be approached both strategically and holistically. On one level, it is a highly specialized field. On another level, it is obviously linked to budgetary questions, economic development, good governance and sound public management. On yet another level, it requires prudent, measured and consistent steps, as well as a well-functioning understanding with the full range of national stakeholders and partners.

The report before the Council, therefore, defines security sector reform as a process of assessment, review and implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation, led by national authorities. The goal is to

strengthen the effective and accountable security of a State and its people, underpinned by respect for human rights and the rule of law.

Allow me to underscore a few key principles that will guide our approach. These reflect the discussions of Member States in the Security Council and the General Assembly.

First and foremost, the United Nations should engage in security sector reform at the request of national Governments, or in response to Security Council mandates and General Assembly resolutions.

Secondly, Member States are the primary providers of security, and national ownership is the cornerstone of our approach. As the Security Council noted last year, "It is the sovereign right and the primary responsibility of the country concerned to determine the national approach and priorities of security sector reform" (S/PRST/2007/3).

Thirdly, the United Nations should work in collaboration with key international partners. Such partnerships are vital in ensuring expertise and resources. This is imperative already at the outset of any peace negotiation and mediation, as successful security sector reform is a necessary precursor of any peacekeeping exit strategy and, ultimately, of economic and social development.

Fourthly, the United Nations approach must be flexible and tailored to the individual country, region or environment. States and societies define and pursue security according to their particular context, history, culture and needs. There can be no rigid one-size-fits-all approach.

Finally, our approach must be gender sensitive and consistent with international law, with particular attention to sexual and gender-based violence. We must help ensure that the security sector assumes its responsibility in eradicating the unspeakable epidemic of violence against women that has become the common aftermath of conflict.

Member States have recognized the need for a coherent system-wide approach to security sector reform and to the need to avoid duplication by creating new frameworks. Let us therefore focus, as a first priority, on professionalizing our approach.

My report proposes a number of straightforward and pragmatic measures: developing United Nations

technical guideline and training in the area of security sector reform; strengthening field capacity as well as capabilities and expertise for central backstopping; enhancing coordination and delivery of security sector reform support; and establishing a compact security sector reform support unit at Headquarters, to serve the whole United Nations, in particular peace operations.

These priorities represent the minimum we must do to enhance our performance. But, beyond these, developing effective and accountable security institutions — including those responsible for the provision of justice — is more than just a goal. It is our shared obligation, especially in countries recovering from conflict.

It is an obligation intricately linked to our capacity to respond rapidly and decisively in times of crisis and to address long-term perspectives. It is central to our ability to create an interrelated system of rapidly deployable capabilities, operating under the United Nations Charter. That is why I warmly welcome the Council's intention to debate this strategic issue later this month, with the participation of the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom.

I am grateful for the Security Council's commitment to our collective endeavour to strengthen the United Nations role in security sector reform.

The President: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

At this meeting the Council will hear briefings by His Excellency Mr. Ján Kubiš, Her Excellency Ms. Susan van der Merwe and His Excellency Mr. Yukio Takasu.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Ján Kubiš.

Mr. Kubiš (Slovakia): Allow me at the outset to express my deep gratitude to the United Kingdom presidency for organizing today's meeting on security sector reform (SSR) — which we deem to be a critical topic for the entire United Nations system — as well as for giving my country, Slovakia, an opportunity to address the Security Council on this topic, which we adopted as our horizontal priority during our work as a Security Council member in 2006 and 2007. I hope and believe that today's Security Council meeting will prove to be yet another useful opportunity not only to discuss this issue but also to provide new impetus and guidance in promoting it.

I also extend my warm thanks to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for introducing in person his report entitled "Securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform" (S/2008/39) and for his valuable remarks.

Slovakia is very pleased with the comprehensive nature of the Secretary-General's report presented today and believes that it is an important milestone in systematizing and strengthening United Nations support for SSR. We are convinced that the report is a good basis for further discussions on this issue among United Nations Member States. In this context, we are pleased to note that, as expected, the report has been issued with two symbols and is thus a document both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. We believe that both the General Assembly and the Security Council and their relevant subsidiary bodies should address the report within the scope of their prerogatives under the United Nations Charter.

Reforming the security sector, particularly in post-conflict environments, is critical to consolidating peace and stability; promoting poverty reduction and economic and social development, the rule of law, justice and good governance; extending legitimate State authority and civilian management of the security and justice sectors, centred on people's needs; and preventing countries from relapsing into conflict. SSR is often one of the most critical elements of long-term efforts to lay the foundation for peace consolidation, which could subsequently, among other things, enable the timely withdrawal of international peacekeepers. SSR is often a crucial component, if not the crucial component, of an exit strategy.

To accomplish this, we believe that there is a growing need for adequate capacity within the United Nations system to be able to respond more effectively to the requests of individual Member States for support in the area of security sector reform. In this context, we strongly support the recommendations of the Secretary-General to establish clear field mechanisms for the coordination and implementation of security sector reform mandates, as well as a United Nations inter-agency security sector reform support unit to provide technical guidance and training, and to promote best practices and a holistic and coherent United Nations approach to security sector reform.

Based on our experience of promoting the issue of security sector reform within the United Nations

system and studying specific cases of carrying out SSR programmes, I would like to use this opportunity to highlight several security sector reform-related principles that we consider particularly crucial.

The first is national ownership and leadership, which simply cannot be overemphasized. SSR always has to be a nationally-owned process that is rooted in the particular needs and conditions of the country in question. National authorities must be involved in all aspects and phases of SSR and must be in the lead. It is the sovereign right and the primary responsibility of the country concerned to determine the national approach and priorities of SSR.

Secondly, there is a need for a holistic, coherent and comprehensive United Nations approach to SSR. The United Nations has been involved in various SSR-related projects and activities for many years. But what is still missing is a systematic, comprehensive and well-coordinated United Nations approach to SSR. We should spare no effort in order to achieve that goal. We believe that we are on the right track, but much more remains to be done, both by the Secretariat, by other members of the United Nations family and by Member States.

Thirdly, there is a need to define basic United Nations principles and guidelines for SSR. As the Secretary-General rightly pointed out in paragraph 48 of his report, this could "ensure that peacekeeping operations and United Nations country teams engaged in reform receive practical guidance and assistance", which they so often call for on the ground. We believe that such principles and guidelines should be elaborated on the basis of existing best practices and lessons learned. The Secretary-General's report provides us with a very good basis and, indeed, with the outline of a framework for this. It is now up to us, the Member States, to further elaborate principles and guidelines and to achieve consensus on them.

Fourthly, there is a need for continued United Nations capacity-building. If the United Nations wants to deliver better and to be able to adequately respond to the numerous requests that it receives from individual Member States, it needs to strengthen its own capacities and to ensure that it can deliver better and in a highly professional manner in the most critical areas. We see the path towards that goal mainly in strengthening the inter-agency approach, including by creating an inter-agency SSR support unit.

All of that should enable us to work more actively and effectively for better coordination of all United Nations activities — with the central role to be played by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the ground — and of international efforts and for better management of available international capacities, linking them more closely with national SSR strategies, policies and capacities, thus reinforcing the principles of national ownership and leadership. Therefore, while the United Nations-focused measures and approaches recommended in the Secretary-General's report are not a goal per se, they would, if supported, help all of us to be more effective and successful on the ground in addressing the realities existing there.

In February 2007, the open debate on SSR (see S/PV.5632) and the adoption of a presidential statement (S/PRST/2007/3) helped attract growing interest among Member States in the topic of security sector reform and to raise awareness about it. This was also reflected in the very positive response to the Slovak initiative to create a United Nations Group of Friends of SSR, which now has more than 30 members from all geographic regions, with various experiences in implementing SSR or supporting it in the field.

Since last year's open debate in the Security Council, tangible progress has been achieved in introducing this issue into the agendas of relevant United Nations bodies. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations has been the first to address the comprehensive report of the Secretary-General, within the scope of its mandate, and we note with satisfaction the fruitful discussion that it held in March. It clearly demonstrated the relevance of this topic to the wider United Nations membership as well as the challenges on the way forward. We believe that another instrumental United Nations body that will play a key role in this area is the Peacebuilding Commission, which has, commendably, included security sector reform within the integrated peacebuilding strategies for the countries on its agenda. We strongly support this.

Among the many tangible results and concrete proofs of the understanding, assistance and cooperation achieved in the realm of SSR was the International Workshop on Enhancing United Nations Support for Security Sector Reform in Africa, held in Cape Town, South Africa, on 7 and 8 November 2007, which Slovakia organized jointly with South Africa. That event and its outcome, in the form of a Co-chairs'

statement, significantly contributed to the efforts aimed at developing an SSR concept within the United Nations based on specific and unique African experience. It was also very helpful in gaining a better understanding of the nature and scope of SSR among African countries, for many of which this issue is of such critical importance. The workshop was also very instrumental in ensuring a wider and more systematic approach to SSR on the part of important regional and subregional partners of the United Nations, in particular the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States and the Southern African Development Community, but also, inter alia, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. This was also shown during the subsequent joint Slovak-South African presentation of workshop outcomes at the African Union Summit in Addis Ababa, on 29 January 2008.

Let me also add that the Cape Town workshop was the beginning of, and an important element in, a regional and subregional approach that we have always promoted. We have also been emphasizing the importance of a bottom-up approach to SSR processes within the United Nations — processes that must be demand-driven and must always be tailored to the specific needs and conditions of the countries or regions concerned. In our opinion, that is the best way to identify effective and functioning mechanisms for United Nations support for SSR. We hope that the Cape Town workshop will be followed by similar events in other parts of the world — for example, in Asia and Latin America — to which Slovakia is ready to contribute.

Let me conclude by emphasizing once again the great need on the ground for increased and enhanced United Nations support for SSR. Over the past several months of our intensive engagement in the area of SSR, we have had ample opportunities to hear such calls and requests, which have come both from national authorities and from United Nations and other international representatives working on a daily basis on the ground. We also believe that, including through today's discussion, the Security Council can make further important contributions in that regard.

Finally, I want to assure members that Slovakia remains actively engaged in and committed to the cause of security sector reform within the United Nations framework and elsewhere. We stand ready to continue assisting in practical terms in any way

necessary. I can assure the Council and the Secretary-General of our full and continuing support in SSR-related efforts.

The President: I thank Mr. Kubiš for his very valuable statement.

I now give the floor to Her Excellency Ms. Susan van der Merwe.

Ms. van der Merwe (South Africa): We thank the United Kingdom for organizing this open briefing on security sector reform (SSR) and welcome the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform" (S/2008/39). My delegation wishes to welcome the efforts of the Secretary-General in promoting security sector reform and expresses appreciation for his recommendations on the way forward. May I also join others in welcoming the participation of the Secretary-General and, of course, the presence of Minister Kubiš and of the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission.

As the Council is aware, Africa has been involved in practicing security sector reform in a number of countries. Our experiences point to the fact that this is not an event, but a process that requires continuous attention and political will. It is a process that is politically sensitive and that must be nationally owned. Thus, security sector reform cannot be imposed on any country or on any institution. National ownership ensures that the process is rooted in the needs and conditions of the country, because each country faces its own unique challenges.

Yet, national ownership, as one of the non-negotiable principles of SSR, is definitely not antithetical to external support. So whatever approach is adopted must be in context and must be country-specific. That is important because our continent has long suffered from many attempts to impose one-size-fits all solutions to security sector reform that have produced more problems than solutions. Until now, there has been a limited understanding of security sector reform that goes beyond traditional military elements and is not State-centric, but rather involves a much wider range of national actors and institutions. That, however, does not negate the fact that Member States are the primary providers of security as both a sovereign right and a responsibility.

Last year, we were very pleased and honoured to join with the Slovak delegation in hosting a seminar in Cape Town attended by many countries. At that seminar, it was made quite clear that security sector reform must of necessity meet the new concept of security that transcends the reductionist perspective that has historically and one-dimensionally equated security with the military aspect and excluded the political, cultural and socio-economic dimensions. In other words, security sector reform is an important pillar for both security and sustainable development.

The new concept of security sector reform implies an all-inclusive process that must address the needs of the people, including the needs of marginalized groups in society, in particular women. The inclusion of their perspectives and concerns in the design and delivery of security is critical. In that way, the people are responsible for making sure that the security sector is a guarantor of security and freedom rather than a threat to it.

However, those experiences from Africa should not be construed to imply that the need for security sector reform is specific to Africa. Indeed, other countries outside the continent have also embarked on the reform of their respective security sectors. However, Africa has some unique challenges that include the general low level of economic development, the fragility and weakness of several African States and the complexities arising from simultaneous interventions of external actors.

South Africa recognizes the importance of close partnerships with the United Nations and non-United Nations actors, in particular regional, subregional and other intergovernmental organizations, including international financial institutions and non-governmental organizations. Security sector reform is a long-term process that requires resources, energies and political will.

The case of Sierra Leone highlights the importance of clear political commitment and leadership to security sector reform from within the country and the crucial long-term support and benefits of a wide-consultative process, while the case of Guinea-Bissau highlights the challenges associated with implementing security sector reform with severe resource constraints. Therefore, effective support that will lead to successful reform of the sector requires capacity, knowledge and

sensitivity and no tension between external support and national ownership in the process.

In fact, there is political will on the part of the partners, but the lack of coordination has undermined the effects of that political will on the ground. In the current atmosphere of a lack of coherent and coordinated approach, international partners are virtually free to determine the elements and directions of their individualized interventions and support to security sector reform. The experience of the Democratic Republic of the Congo highlights the complexities of the problems that flow from uncoordinated external support to security sector reform.

That is precisely because there is no code of ethics or conduct and policy guidelines that are universally acceptable to international partners and agreeable to States undertaking security sector reform. It was that observation of the negative consequences of an uncoordinated approach and a lack of guiding principles that informed our partnership with Slovakia to advocate for an enhanced United Nations role in security sector reform.

The legitimacy and global character of the United Nations give it a particular responsibility to facilitate a coordinated approach. We appreciate that the United Nations has been doing some work on security sector reform, but most of its activities in that regard have been ad hoc and without a framework to provide guidance. Fundamental to the assistance and expertise that the United Nations provides are the cooperation and consent of the State involved. We hope that the discussion here today will move us a step closer to a more coordinated approach to security sector reform.

The President: I now give the floor to Mr. Yukio Takasu, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Takasu: I would like to express my deep appreciation to you, Sir, for inviting me, in my capacity as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, to address the Council on security sector reform. My gratitude goes to the Secretary-General for his briefing and his endeavours on promoting this matter. I am also grateful to Mr. Ján Kubiš, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia, for his presence here today and the leadership role of his country. The presence of Deputy Foreign Minister Van der Merwe of the Republic of South Africa is welcome.

Ensuring security is a precondition for any peacebuilding effort in countries emerging from conflict. In order to achieve sustainable peace in such countries, it is critically important to strengthen local capacity in the security sector by carrying out effective reform with the assistance of the international community. If we fail to successfully address that important challenge, it will certainly cause a serious peacebuilding gap, which will hamper a smooth shift beyond peacekeeping activities and a gradual transition to longer-term socio-economic development in the overall peace continuum. Security sector reform has broad implications for such peacebuilding efforts as reconciliation, social integration and youth empowerment.

That is why security sector reform is one of the high priority issues in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. It was with that in mind that the Commission held thematic discussions on the reform of the security and justice sectors in its country-specific meetings. Throughout its work, the Peacebuilding Commission has put emphasis on ownership — priorities to be identified by the Government and commitment to fulfilling its responsibility. In the consultative process involving all stakeholders, the Commission develops an integrated peacebuilding strategy. Security sector reform has been identified as a priority area both in Sierra Leone and in Burundi. Those frameworks and monitoring mechanisms describe the challenges faced and the commitments to be met by both the Government itself and other stakeholders locally and internationally.

Sierra Leone has been widely viewed as an example of successful security sector reform. The Cooperation Framework contains specific commitments on the part of the Government to review the conditions and terms of service of its armed forces, to reduce the size of the armed forces, and to provide training to improve police and community relations. The report of the Chair of the Sierra Leone country-specific configuration underscores that the Government of Sierra Leone has been making impressive progress in meeting its commitments. I believe that the upcoming high-level stakeholders consultation on Sierra Leone on 19 May presents a useful opportunity to highlight security sector reform initiatives led by the Government, with the support of its international partners, including the United Nations and the United Kingdom, and to seek additional support for continued reforms.

The Peacebuilding Commission's engagement with Burundi has focused on consolidating the important gains made to date through the reorganization of the army and the police and the demobilization of combatants. At this moment, a delegation from the Peacebuilding Commission is visiting Burundi. Recent violent clashes between the Palipehutu-Forces nationales de libération and Government security forces and the ensuing worsening of the security situation will be an important issue for discussion during the visit. I would like to emphasize that continued international support for security sector reform is critical to laying the foundation for effective peacebuilding efforts in that country.

With regard to Guinea-Bissau, security sector reform is identified as one of the most important peacebuilding priorities through the interaction with the Government. During the Peacebuilding Commission's visit to the country recently, the participants concurred with the view of the stakeholders on the ground that successful implementation of Guinea-Bissau's security sector reform plan published in November 2006 was key to the country's stability. The Commission is now in the process of developing an integrated strategy reflecting the priority concerns of the country.

As designed to address any gap in the early stage of the peacebuilding process, the Peace Building Fund plays a catalytic role in support of various security sector reform initiatives. In Sierra Leone, the Fund provided support to strengthen police capacities in the lead-up to the national elections and to improve the conditions of military barracks. In Burundi, it supported reform efforts of the national police and the intelligence services. In Guinea-Bissau, a project to rehabilitate prisons and provide support to the judiciary police is currently under consideration, to be funded through the Peacebuilding Fund.

Allow me to now briefly offer some of my own observations on security sector reform, in the light of the experiences gained through the work of the Peacebuilding Commission over the past two years.

First, security sector reform must be a nationally owned process. The governments concerned should lead not only the planning process but also the implementation of such reform. The commitment by national leaders to fulfilling their responsibility for such reform is essential to producing results and inducing international support.

Secondly, security sector reform requires long-term, predictable and sustainable support and assistance from the wider international community. It is important to involve all national and international stakeholders from the early stages of planning in order to ensure a smooth transition from peacekeeping to recovery and sustainable development. In coordination with the efforts of local actors, United Nations agencies, individual countries, regional and international organizations, including international financial institutions, and civil society are all equipped to make various contributions to that end.

Thirdly, a coordinated, coherent and integrated approach is indispensable in addressing the multifaceted nature of security sector reform. Such reform requires the active involvement of a wide range of national and international actors with diverse expertise and specialties. It also needs to take into account its close links with such matters as the rule of law and good governance and the necessity to integrate gender perspectives.

For all those reasons, I believe that the Peacebuilding Commission can make significant contributions to promoting security sector reform by providing a valuable forum for coordinated efforts by all relevant actors on the basis of integrated strategies. I would like to assure the Council that the Commission will continue to pay the utmost attention to mobilizing international support and resources for the efforts of countries emerging from conflict, based on mutual engagement, with the aim of having a real impact on the ground.

The President: I thank Mr. Takasu for his statement.

There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded its consideration of the item on its agenda. In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I should now like to invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion on the subject.

The meeting rose at 3.45 p.m.



Security Council

Sixty-third year

Provisional

5890th meeting

Monday, 12 May 2008, 6.45 p.m.

New York

President:	Sir John Sawers	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
Members:	Belgium	Mr. Belle
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Tiendrébéogo
	China	Mr. Huang Hongjiang
	Costa Rica	Mr. Weisleder
	Croatia	Mr. Viločić
	France	Mr. Leclerc
	Indonesia	Mr. Kleib
	Italy	Mr. Azzarello
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Panama	Mr. Suescum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	South Africa	Mr. Kumalo
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

Maintenance of international peace and security: role of the Security Council in supporting security sector reform

Report of the Secretary-General on securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform (S/2008/39)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.



The meeting was called to order at 6.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Maintenance of international peace and security: role of the Security Council in supporting security sector reform

Report of the Secretary-General on securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform (S/2008/39)

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2008/39, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform.

Following consultations among the members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council recalls the statement by its President of 21 February 2007 (S/PRST/2007/3) and emphasizes that security sector reform is an essential element of any stabilization and reconstruction process in post-conflict environments. The Security Council recognizes that the establishment of an effective, professional and accountable security sector is one of the necessary elements for laying the foundations for peace and sustainable development.

"The Security Council welcomes the Secretary-General's efforts on security sector reform and takes note of his report entitled 'Securing peace and development: the role of the United Nations in supporting security sector reform' of 23 January 2008 (S/2008/39).

"The Security Council commends Slovakia and South Africa for their joint initiative in holding the International Workshop on Enhancing United Nations Support for Security Sector Reform in Africa on 7-8 November 2007 and

takes note of the letter dated 20 November 2007 from the Permanent Representatives of Slovakia and South Africa (S/2007/687). The Security Council encourages further similar activities.

"The Security Council recognizes that security sector reform is a long-term process and reiterates that it is the sovereign right and primary responsibility of the country concerned to determine its national approach and priorities for security sector reform. It should be a nationally owned process that is rooted in the particular needs and conditions of the country in question. The Security Council underlines that the strong support of the United Nations and international community is also critical in strengthening national capacities thereby reinforcing national ownership, which is crucial for the sustainability of the process.

"The Security Council recognizes the important role that the United Nations has played in supporting national security sector reform efforts and underlines the need for its continued engagement. In this regard, the Security Council emphasizes the need to develop a holistic and coherent United Nations approach to security sector reform as recommended by the Secretary-General, in close consultation with Member States.

"The Security Council underlines that United Nations support to security sector reform must take place within a broad framework of the rule of law and should contribute to the overall strengthening of the United Nations rule of law activities as well as wider reconstruction and development efforts. This will require coordination with all relevant United Nations actors, in particular the Rule of Law Coordination and Resource Group, to ensure coherence of approach.

"The Security Council emphasizes the important role that the Peacebuilding Commission, through its integrated peacebuilding strategies, can play in ensuring continuous international support to countries emerging from conflict. The Security Council also recognizes the importance of continued close cooperation and partnerships with non-United Nations actors, in particular regional, subregional and other intergovernmental organizations, including international financial

institutions and bilateral donors, as well as non-governmental organizations.

"The Security Council requests the Secretary-General to continue to include, wherever appropriate, recommendations related to security sector reform in his periodic reports on United Nations operations mandated by the Security Council."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2008/14.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.



Security Council

Sixty-third year

Provisional

5891st meeting

Tuesday, 13 May 2008, 3 p.m.
New York

<i>President:</i>	Sir John Sawers	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
<i>Members:</i>	Belgium	Mr. Verbeke
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Tiendrébéogo
	China	Mr. Du Xiacong
	Costa Rica	Mr. Weisleder
	Croatia	Mr. Viločić
	France	Mr. Lacroix
	Indonesia	Mr. Kleib
	Italy	Mr. Mantovani
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Panama	Mr. Suescum
	Russian Federation	Mr. Dolgov
	South Africa	Mr. Kumalo
	United States of America	Mr. Khalilzad
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.



The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Sudan, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mohamad (Sudan) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Following consultations among the members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council strongly condemns the attacks of 10 May perpetrated by the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) against the

Sudanese Government in Omdurman, and urges all parties to cease violence immediately, respect their obligations under international humanitarian law and commit to a peaceful resolution of all outstanding issues.

"The Security Council urges restraint by all parties and, in particular, warns that no retaliatory action should be taken against civilian populations, or that has an impact on stability in the region.

"The Security Council reiterates the urgent need for all parties to engage fully and constructively in the political process. The Security Council calls upon the States of the region to implement their commitments under the Dakar Accord, and to cooperate with a view to putting an end to the activities of armed groups and their attempts to seize power by force.

"The Security Council strongly condemns all attempts at destabilization by force, and reaffirms its commitment to the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of Sudan."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2008/15.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 3.10 p.m.



Security Council

Sixty-third year

Provisional

5892nd meeting

Wednesday, 14 May 2008, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Sir John Sawers	(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
Members:	Belgium	Mr. Belle
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Tiendrébéogo
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Weisleder
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. De Rivière
	Indonesia	Mr. Kleib
	Italy	Mr. Mantovani
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Panama	Mr. Arias
	Russian Federation	Mr. Dolgov
	South Africa	Mr. Kumalo
	United States of America	Mr. Khalilzad
	Viet Nam	Mrs. Nguyen Thanh Ha

Agenda

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan

Report of the Secretary-General on the deployment of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (S/2008/304)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.



The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan

Report of the Secretary-General on the deployment of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (S/2008/304)

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Affairs.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Guéhenno to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2008/304 which contains the report of the Secretary-General on the deployment of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Affairs. I now give him the floor.

Mr. Guéhenno (spoke in French): Thank you, Mr. President, for this opportunity to introduce the latest 30-day report of the Secretary-General, covering the month of April, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 1769 (2007). I will begin my briefing with an update on the fighting that took place over the past weekend in Omdurman between rebel fighters and Government of Sudan forces, which has been a source of great concern for all of us. I will then give an overview of the security and humanitarian situation in Darfur, and will provide Council members with additional detail on the deployment of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) and related priorities as outlined in the

30-day report. I will also provide a brief update on the Special Envoys' efforts on the political track.

With regard to the security situation, as the Council will be aware, fighting broke out over the weekend in Omdurman, which is located on the west bank of the Nile river and is one of the three principal urban areas of the Khartoum region. On Friday, 9 May, the Government of Sudan informed the diplomatic community in Khartoum that it had received reports of some 200 to 300 vehicles of the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) advancing from Northern Darfur towards Omdurman and the city of El Obeid in Northern Kordofan. The Government stated that the Sudanese Armed Forces had engaged these JEM elements, through aerial attacks, near El Obeid, and warned the diplomatic community to be alert.

On the afternoon of Saturday, 10 May, the United Nations Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS) reported that fighting had broken out in Omdurman between the Government forces and the JEM fighters. Media and local sources report that JEM elements took over a police station in Omdurman by force, killing around six local police there. Reports on the size of the JEM incursion ranged from a column of 80 to 300 vehicles. The Government of Sudan alleged that the JEM forces involved were supported and armed by Chadian Government elements. The Government retaliated, killing JEM fighters and destroying their vehicles. Reportedly, sporadic fighting continued until nightfall. According to a Government source, some 20 to 30 JEM vehicles were destroyed and some 200 JEM personnel arrested. Remaining JEM personnel then reportedly scattered to villages to the north and west of the capital. The overall number of casualties incurred during the fighting remains unclear at present, although a number of bodies have been shown on Government media broadcasts.

The Government imposed a curfew on Saturday, 10 May, beginning at 5 p.m. local time in Omdurman and Khartoum. The curfew was lifted in Khartoum on 11 May at 12.30 p.m. local time but remains in place in Omdurman, where Government forces have reportedly conducted house-to-house searches for JEM fighters and their weapons.

(spoke in English)

The Government of Sudan accused Chad of supporting the attack. President Omer Al-Bashir appeared on State television late on Saturday night and

announced the severance of diplomatic ties with Chad. According to media reports, State security forces ransacked the Chadian embassy in Khartoum on Sunday morning and confiscated documents. On 11 May, the Government of Chad issued a statement expressing its surprise that Sudan had severed diplomatic relations between the two countries. The Government of Chad further denied any involvement in the incident.

In El Fasher, the situation remains calm, and UNAMID is continuing limited patrols with force protection, although the temporary closure of airports interrupted the movements of rations and personnel. We are very concerned that the movement of significant numbers of JEM fighters from Darfur all the way to Khartoum went undetected and took both UNAMID and the Government by surprise. The incident underscores the serious shortfalls in the Mission's resources, especially in its aerial reconnaissance capabilities. We will, in the meantime, work with UNAMID to find ways of improving its monitoring capabilities using currently available resources. Equally worryingly, UNAMID Sector West has received unconfirmed report that the Sudan Liberation Army-Unity (SLA-Unity) is gathering forces with over 40 vehicles near Khor Abeche to attack El Fasher. In addition, there have been reports of JEM and Chadian armed elements crossing the border and assembling in Western Darfur.

We continue to monitor the situation closely. UNMIS and UNAMID are in contact with the Sudanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Defence and other Government authorities to seek the full reopening of airports and explore alternative options to move the Missions' assets and personnel if the situation further deteriorates. In N'Djamena, the situation remains calm so far, but United Nations staff in Chad has been advised to stay alert. We will, of course, update the Council on any significant developments.

This is a deeply disturbing development that has implications for the already complex security situation on the ground in Darfur, but also for the operations of UNAMID as well as for the efforts to revitalize the Darfur political negotiations, for the Chad-Sudan relationship and, indeed, for Sudanese national politics.

We are primarily concerned about the threat that that escalation poses to UNAMID supply lines from

Port Sudan to Darfur through El Obeid. Possible retaliatory operations by the Government could also lead to further escalation that may impede UNAMID deployment and operations. The attack may also result in setbacks in the ongoing efforts by the Special Envoys to bring the parties together in Geneva to discuss security issues. Furthermore, there is a possibility for an intensification of what sometimes looks like a proxy war between Chad and the Sudan, which would jeopardize the implementation of the Dakar Accord. On 12 May, the Secretary-General issued a statement through his Spokesperson condemning the use of armed force by JEM to achieve political ends and calling for an immediate cessation of hostilities.

The JEM attack on Omdurman comes during an alarming increase in violence in Darfur itself. During the past six weeks alone, there has been violence between the rebel movements and the Sudanese armed forces, as well as between factions of the movements. That has occurred in both South and North Darfur. Those engagements have included aerial bombardments on rebel positions, including on villages occupied by civilians.

Taken with the increasingly volatile situation on the Chad-Sudan border and the increased banditry targeting United Nations assets, the security situation in Darfur is deteriorating at an alarming rate. The 30-day report includes a detailed description of the specific security incidents that took place during the reporting period.

I should now like to turn to the humanitarian situation, because the ongoing violence has also had a direct impact on humanitarian operations. Thirty-eight commercial trucks hired by the World Food Programme to transport supplies into Darfur were hijacked during the period under review. That has forced the agency to halve rations beginning in the month of May, which will have serious implications for the health and well-being of over 3 million beneficiaries of food aid in Darfur. That also comes at a time when malnutrition indicators remain at extremely worrying levels in many areas of the region.

As a result of violent clashes in all three states so far this year, more than 150,000 civilians have been forced to flee their homes, at a rate of more than 1,200 per day. Increased tribal fighting in South Darfur forced more than 50,000 people to flee the area in the

month of April alone. While some moved to already overstretched camps such as Al Salam, near Nyala, and El Neem, in El Daein, others have reportedly fled to very remote areas that are often inaccessible to humanitarian organizations.

As I have just said, the situation of Darfur's conflict-affected population is growing more precarious by the day as a result of the security situation. With rations reduced by half, with only minimal amounts of food and other relief materials pre-positioned in advance of the rainy season and access decreasing, it is now more important than ever that the parties show full respect for international humanitarian law and ensure full access to populations requiring humanitarian assistance.

Deploying UNAMID has been and will continue to be an extremely complex and difficult undertaking. The circumstances that I have just described pose additional complications. As members can see from the report before the Council, UNAMID is increasing its activities with each passing month, but it still needs to be strengthened considerably before it will be able to implement its mandate.

The process of bringing the Mission to that level of capability has been too slow thus far. Finalizing arrangements with troop and police contributors has been a painstaking and time-consuming process. Troop contributors have justifiably taken time to fully prepare for deployment into a complex and insecure environment. Moving goods from Port Sudan is taking far longer than anticipated and has recently become perilous, with much of the equipment being hijacked on the open road. Within the Mission itself we have seen plans delayed by operational difficulties associated with the great distances to be travelled, the harsh environment and the ongoing and detailed discussions with authorities that are required to take forward most major actions. We must remain conscious of the need to balance the deployment of personnel with a supply chain that is robust enough to support them in Darfur.

Those factors have slowed deployment considerably and have required a thorough review and enhancement of our plan to deploy UNAMID, so that the Mission can have maximum effect on the ground as soon as possible. To that end, Assistant Secretary-General Jane Holl Lute and a supporting technical team travelled to El Fasher from 11 to 17 April to develop an

enhanced plan with the UNAMID leadership aimed at maximizing the deployment of military and police personnel by the end of 2008. If that plan is fully implemented, UNAMID could be at 80 per cent of its authorized strength by the end of this year.

That total is based on an ambitious calculation concerning which units will be prepared to deploy within the coming months and how quickly preparations can be completed for their reception in Darfur. The result would be that by the end of 2008 15,300 out of 19,555 troops, 3,018 out of 3,772 individual police officers and 12 out of 19 formed police units will be deployed to Darfur. To reach those targets, we will have to deploy a considerable number and wide range of units.

First, key enabling units, including engineering, transportation, multi-role logistics and medical units, should deploy before the rainy season.

Secondly, the current 10 infantry battalions already deployed — four from Nigeria, four from Rwanda, one from Senegal and one from South Africa — must undertake rotations at the United Nations standard of strength and equipment. Currently, those battalions are smaller than the United Nations standard of 800 soldiers.

Thirdly, six new battalions — two from Ethiopia, two from Egypt, one from Senegal and one from Thailand — as well as two new companies from Nepal will have to deploy this year. We are planning for the deployment of the Thai and Nepalese units immediately following the arrival of the first Egyptian and Ethiopian battalions in Darfur, based on the understanding reached between the Secretary-General and President Al-Bashir on the margins of the Organization of the Islamic Conference Summit in Dakar. In fact, the Secretary-General recently wrote to President Al-Bashir to confirm that understanding.

Finally, 11 additional formed police units should deploy in 2008.

One of the central requirements for the success of the enhanced deployment plan is a significant strengthening of the Mission's engineering capability. It is engineers that can expedite the building of austere camps and establish the minimal infrastructure required for units to deploy. There are currently engineering works ongoing within the Mission, including by commercial contractors. The Council will

recall that three military engineering companies — from China, Egypt and Pakistan — are included in the Mission's force composition. The advance party of the Chinese company has established itself in South Darfur. While there have been difficulties in delivering their equipment, we have had very good and encouraging news from China that the deployment is going to proceed shortly and that possible reinforcements can come from other parts of the Sudan. Advance elements from the Egyptian company are in Darfur. We expect them to initiate activities by early next month. We are also finalizing with Pakistan a late shift in the unit location, after which the deployment will take place.

Those three companies will have a critical role to play in the establishment and functioning of the Mission, but meeting our targets now requires a considerable augmentation of engineering capabilities. On the military side we have already taken a number of concrete steps to that end. We are working through the possibility of temporarily deploying to Darfur elements of the Chinese, Egyptian and Pakistani engineering elements within UNMIS, with full consideration being given to the implications for UNMIS. We are requesting that incoming battalions from Ethiopia, Egypt, Senegal and Thailand include a light engineering capability. And we are asking targeted troop-contributing countries to consider contributing an additional dedicated engineering unit to the Mission.

As the Council will note, we are pursuing multiple avenues to strengthen the Mission's engineering capability, because that is a fundamental requirement for us to achieve our objectives. But strengthened engineering capability is not the only requirement for enhanced deployment. There must also be a similar improvement in the movement of goods from Port Sudan to Darfur. Customs clearance is currently taking one month, which is too long. Insecurity and banditry on the roads from El Obeid and throughout Darfur are causing local contractors to refuse to transport Mission assets along these routes. The road movement of equipment from Port Sudan to Darfur, a distance of 1,400 miles, takes on average seven weeks. This is also too long if we are to meet the deployment targets for 2008.

Government assistance in providing security along the Mission pipeline from Port Sudan to Darfur is, therefore, critical. We are encouraged by the discussions that the Government has already had with

UNAMID on this issue, and we look forward to increased cooperation in this area. At the same time, the Department of Field Support is actively exploring alternatives, such as the movement of goods by air from El Obeid to Darfur. The Department is also looking into the opening of other land routes. The air bridge option would require the Government of Sudan to open airports to United Nations activity 24 hours a day, seven days a week, as well as to increase United Nations ramp space at airports.

Another key aspect for implementation of the plan will be the provision by the Government of the land required to build new sites for camps in a number of locations, on the one hand, and to expand existing camps to receive rotating battalions, on the other. Those camps will also require secure access to water, which will have to be guaranteed by the Government.

We are depending heavily on our troop contributors to help us deliver the enhanced plan. We are asking for an increase in size in the battalions already in situ. In some cases we have approached troop contributors to alter the composition of military units so as to introduce engineering capability. In other cases we are asking them to transfer assets between missions. We are also asking them to deploy to locations where conditions will be austere and where military units will have to exist under the most basic conditions. We will be working most urgently with those who have not yet finalized preparations for deployment, since it now takes an average of five months from finalization of arrangements to the arrival in Darfur of a fully equipped unit.

To achieve that last and critical objective — unit readiness — we will also be relying on donors who are working with specific troop-contributing countries to ensure that they have what is required to deploy to and to function in the challenging environment of Darfur. A number of donor countries, including a group that meets regularly as the Friends of UNAMID, have been making good progress in training and equipping UNAMID troop-contributing countries. The continued efforts of the Friends of UNAMID are greatly appreciated and will be indispensable in meeting our deployment targets. That work will have to be complemented by equally serious efforts to ensure that deploying units are self-sustaining so that they can focus their energies on implementing the mandate.

We will also require sustained cooperation from the Government. Joint Special Representative Rodolphe Adada has reported that there are regular and productive consultations taking place between the Mission and the Government. We will rely heavily on those consultations being effective in our efforts to secure the land and access to water and to improve the speed at which goods move across the country. Those are all fundamental requirements of the enhanced deployment plan.

With regard to formed police units, there is continued uncertainty regarding the readiness status of most of the 11 units that are scheduled to deploy in 2008. In addition to the formed police unit from Bangladesh, which is operational in Nyala, preparations for the deployment of only two other formed police units, from Nepal and Indonesia, are complete. The ability of all other formed police units to deploy in 2008 has yet to be confirmed by the police-contributing countries, which include Egypt, Senegal, Nigeria and Pakistan. Pledged formed police units from Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Mali require assistance with equipment and training. We look to donors to assist those units in completing deployment preparations within the next two to three months, or else they will not be in a position to deploy in 2008. Finally, we hope Nigeria and Indonesia will respond favourably to our requests for one additional formed police unit each.

Last, but certainly not least, I must mention the missing capabilities — those for which we have not yet received a pledge from a troop-contributing country. Almost nine months after the adoption of resolution 1769 (2007), we continue to face shortfalls in critical areas of the force. We still lack three medium utility helicopter units, one aerial reconnaissance unit, one medium transport unit, one heavy transport unit and one multi-role logistics unit. While predeployment preparations are under way for the light tactical helicopter unit offered by Ethiopia, four additional light helicopters are still being sought in order to meet the operational requirements of the Mission. At the same time, there is still a requirement to identify, in collaboration with the African Union, police-contributing countries that have the capability to deploy the remaining seven formed police units.

I would like to once again emphasize that the successful implementation of the enhanced deployment plan is critically dependant on the assistance of the

stakeholders whom I have just mentioned. The Department of Peacekeeping Operations will continue to work with those actors to ensure that we are moving forward together in a coordinated and expeditious manner to achieve our deployment goals.

I would like to conclude my remarks by turning briefly to the political process and work being led by Special Envoys Eliasson and Salim. In this context, it is important first to say a few words about the recently concluded population census in Sudan.

After a number of delays, Sudan's fifth population census was carried out from 22 April to 6 May 2008. While it was successful in many areas of Sudan, the enumeration process in Darfur experienced a number of obstacles. As a result of the prevailing security situation in Darfur, and due to warnings received from the rebel movements in areas that they control, enumerators were unable to reach many locations, including in the region of the border with Chad. The non-signatories to the Darfur Peace Agreement, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and the Mini Minawi faction of the Sudan Liberation Army all voiced their opposition to the census, which further hampered efforts to count the population in those areas.

Preliminary estimates by international observers indicate that out of a total of 81 IDP camps throughout Darfur, 25 per cent fully participated in the census, 10 per cent participated partially and over 50 per cent did not participate at all. That will complicate efforts to adjust power- and wealth-sharing arrangements as stipulated by the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and will also make it difficult to determine political constituencies prior to Sudan's general election in 2009.

With respect to the political process in Darfur, the Special Envoys have continued to focus their consultations with the parties on convening a dialogue on security-related issues. The Envoys' objective is for those consultations to be initiated by the end of May, and they are intensively engaging both the Government and the five movement groupings — JEM, SLM-Abdul Wahid faction, SLM-Abdul Shafie, SLM-Unity and the United Resistance Front. In the coming period, the mediation will also continue its work to encourage cohesiveness and the development of common positions within and among the parties, as well to include civil society groups in the political process.

The United Nations and the African Union are also continuing their intensive search for a chief mediator, who would be based full-time in Sudan to strengthen the African Union-United Nations mediation. We are working to identifying the appropriate individual as soon as possible.

The Security Council visited Sudan one year ago this summer and will do so again in a matter of weeks. In the time that has elapsed since the Council's last visit, the situation in Darfur has grown infinitely more complex and prospects for peace seem more remote. The parties are not demonstrating the political will to abandon the military option, engage in negotiations or fully cooperate with UNAMID and the humanitarian

community. The situation calls for a redoubling of efforts to bring the parties to the negotiating table and, in the meantime, to deploy a peacekeeping operation capable of making a positive contribution. We will continue to work with our partners to achieve the ambitious objectives we have set in both those areas.

The President: I thank Mr. Guéhenno for his briefing.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I should now like to invite Council members to informal consultations on the same subject.

The meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.